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COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN THE CAMBRIDGE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM: WHY IT FAILED
Glenda Skiffer

This thesis analyzes the lack of success of citizen participation in the Cambridge Model Cities Program. Success is defined as:

1. A broad base of community involvement in the program.
2. Support of resident leaders by the community.
3. Resident leaders must have an identifiable constituency to whom they are accountable.
4. Resident leaders are only able to represent their constituency when they communicate with them and know what they want to see accomplished and the methods for accomplishment they favor.

This thesis will explain what happened to prevent successful citizen participation in the Cambridge Model Cities Program.

1. No new resident leaders were encouraged to participate when Model Cities came into the neighborhood.
2. There was no broad base of community support for Model Cities or the resident leaders.
3. Citizens had no confidence in the ability of the Model Cities program to change their lives for the better, because of their experiences with other federal programs.
4. There was conflict between the city's desire to control the program and the resident's desire to control the program.
The reasons for Cambridge Model Cities' inability to have successful community participation:

1. Resident leaders were self-directed, having been neighborhood leaders for so long they no longer turned to the community for a mandate, or direction.

2. Cambridge Model Cities did not have an ongoing program for mobilizing citizens and developing new leadership.

3. Residents and the city did not work together to make the program a success; they worked from a stance of confrontation.

4. There was a conflict in the Model Cities guidelines between producing programs and developing citizen participation within the time limitations of the program.
I. INTRODUCTION AND METHODS

The purpose of this thesis is to provide a framework for successful citizen participation by analyzing an unsuccessful effort at citizen participation, in order to profit from the mistakes of the unsuccessful effort. My assumption is that successful citizen participation requires a broad base of community support and involvement in the effort. Citizen participation requires citizen leaders who will maintain open communication between themselves and the community. Leaders must have a mandate from the community and a sense of responsibility to the community. The community must select its leaders and mobilize to support its leaders during crises.

The thesis is a case history of participation in the Cambridge Model Cities Program with special attention given to the particular project of planning for a Neighborhood Facilities Grant (NFG) application for the neighborhood. The Neighborhood Facilities Program is administered by HUD to provide for community service centers in low income areas. Upon approval of an application HUD provides from two-thirds to three-fourths of the funds for building a one-stop community service center.

Based on my experiences working at Cambridge Model
Cities preparing the NFG application I found that citizen participation in the neighborhood was not successful. This lack of success was demonstrated in several ways. Resident leaders, people living in the area who had been elected by other residents to represent them on citizens' boards in the neighborhood or who influence decisions effecting the neighborhood because of long time involvement with social agencies serving the neighborhood, did not have a communication network to or from the residents. The community did not provide a base of support for resident leaders. Generally residents had no sense of involvement in the Cambridge Model Cities Program, no awareness of what was happening in the program, and no means of informing their leaders about what they wanted to see from the program. This situation did not exist merely in the particular case of planning for the NFG, but throughout the Cambridge Model Cities Program.

Most residents in the neighborhood had no faith in seeing anything accomplished for them through the Model Cities Program. Resident leaders were self-directed and not responsive to their community.

In the beginning Cambridge did not mobilize the community for support or get new people involved in Model Cities. The resident leaders of the program were the same people who had been leaders before the program. These leaders were entrenched; unable to change their mode of operation to
let other residents participate and afraid of losing the power they felt they had.

The legislation and guidelines for Model Cities had a built-in conflict between producing programs and providing for citizen participation within the constraints of time and the availability of funds. This too contributed to the lack of success of citizen participation in the Cambridge Model Cities Program.

This thesis should be useful in helping others design a successful community participation mechanism within or without the constraints of a Model Cities Program. The case study should prove especially useful to students of planning who are involving themselves with a program controlled by residents, or who are attempting to establish resident control in a community.

From January 1971 to June 1972 I have been observing the Cambridge Model Cities Program. My first exposure to this program was during the five months from January 1971 to May 1971. As part of a design class from MIT I worked in the Planning Department of Model Cities doing research on the housing conditions and housing ownership patterns in the neighborhood. From June 1971 through June 1972 I was employed part-time by Model Cities to prepare an application for a Neighborhood Facilities Grant. The preparation of the application involved working with the staff of Model Cities;
resident groups and individuals; as well as the staff and resident representatives of other agencies serving the neighborhood. The type of involvement I have had with Model Cities and the length of my involvement have been the most reliable resources for this thesis.

Research methods included a review of the literature on resident participation. Field research was done throughout the one and one-half years I worked at Model Cities. This includes numerous interviews and meetings as required by my employment at Model Cities, as well as formal and informal interviews of people with past and present involvements with Model Cities.
II. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE CONTEXT OF
THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM AND THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Model Cities

Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (P.L. 754) provides for a new program designed to demonstrate how the living environment and the general welfare of people living in slum and blighted neighborhoods can be substantially improved in cities of all sizes and in all parts of the country. It calls for a comprehensive attack on social, economic and physical problems in selected slum and blighted areas through the most effective and economical concentration and coordination of Federal, State, and local public and private efforts. The statute provides financial and technical assistance to enable cities to plan, develop and carry out comprehensive local programs containing new and imaginative proposals to develop "model" neighborhoods.¹

Local public bodies desiring to participate in the demonstration were required to submit a proposal describing the social, economic, and physical problems of the proposed Model Neighborhood, what the city proposed to do about these problems, and the administrative structure to be used. After accepting a proposal the federal government would pay eighty percent of the cost of planning a detailed program. Having accepted the final program proposal the federal government would then provide the city with the funds to carry out the

City Demonstration Agency (CDA) is the original name for the nationwide Model Cities Agencies. Model Cities, the name most people know for CDA, was first used by President Johnson because "demonstration" sounded too much like social protest.

Model Cities was to coordinate all the existing federal programs in a neighborhood. Supplemental funds were awarded for a wide range of activities and on the basis of how many other federal aid programs were tied into the package. It was hoped the new program would avoid the mistakes of the CAP programs, started two years before. The Demonstration City Act provided for "widespread citizen participation" rather than the stronger idea of "maximum feasible participation" provided in the OEO program. Unlike the poverty program, local city authorities were given ultimate control and responsibility for the Model Cities program.

The bill was passed November, 1966. The guidelines were prepared by January, 1967 with constant additions thereafter. Applications were due May 1 for the first round.

---

2 "Improving the Quality of Urban Life," pp. 1-4.

3 Howard W. Hallman, Neighborhood Control of Public Programs (New York, 1970), p. 188.

4 Interview with Justin Gray.
selection; nearly 200 cities sent applications. Notification of the cities accepted was scheduled for June. The awards of the first 63 cities were postponed until November. This was presumably to avoid having Congressmen from districts with rejected applications vote against appropriating funds for the planning year.5

Model Cities was to force neighborhood and local governments to function together.

Section 103(a)(2) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 required that a Model Cities Program provide for "widespread citizen participation in the program."6

The section goes on further to say each city would be able to design a program for citizen participation based on the circumstances of that city, within the (vague) guidelines of the HUD directives. Each city chosen for the program held different interpretations of the HUD guidelines.

Later guidelines required an organization structure for citizen involvement and that leaders in the structure must be felt by citizens to represent their interest. Leaders were to be provided with the skills to make knowledgeable decisions.7

---

5 Hallman, pp. 87-90.
No precise criterion is outlined.

The local governing body was required to submit the application and to be responsible for the program. The city was given ultimate authority over the program, but neighborhood-city cooperation was stressed. 8

Assistant HUD Secretary for Model Cities and Governmental Relations, Floyd Hyde, stated the three basic objectives of Model Cities were to improve the delivery of services, to make appropriate changes in existing institutions, and to strengthen local government.

The Model Cities concept is founded upon the belief that the basic political processes are the right ones to develop and that the federal government should devote its resources to linking the disadvantaged into the relevant institutional channels. 9

Both the Johnson and Nixon administrations emphasized that ultimate control of the program rests with city government.

The Arnstein and FOX report says two-thirds of the cities receiving planning grants through July 1968 opted for election as the mechanism for choosing neighborhood representatives. The other cities preferred nominations from organizations or appointment by the city official in charge. Federal bureaucrats favored elected representation.* In Chicago, Mayor Daley wanted to appoint all the board members.

8 Alan A. Altshuler, Community Control (New York, 1970), p. 112


*Altshuler, p. 112.
HUD would not accept this proposal. A compromise was reached allowing Daley to appoint half the members with the others being elected. 10

Through mid 1968 HUD reported turnout from election of representatives were from 7 to 11 percent range. Four programs had turnouts between 24 and 40 percent. 11 Cambridge was in this latter group.

Several cities had experience in the anti-poverty programs. In these cities residents had experience with city hall and the planning process. Dayton, Ohio; Oakland, California; and Cambridge were among the cities that used their experience to see that the city did not dominate the planning period. 12 HUD allows one year for the planning process no matter what the size or political structure of the program.

The AIP Journal has provided commentary on the Model Cities program during the program's early years. In 1966 a series of commentaries on the program appeared in the journal. James Q. Wilson and Bernard Frieden commented on the possible objectives of early visible results and maximum coordination


11 Altshuler, pp. 138-39.

12 See Hallman for a report of the significant role played by residents in the Dayton and Oakland programs; "Neighborhood Control in Two Model Cities," pp. 187-204.
by the local municipal authority. 13

In the July 1969 issue of the AIP Journal, Roland L. Warren presented an article on the Model Cities planning process in nine cities: Oakland, California; Denver, Colorado; Atlanta, Georgia; Newark, New Jersey; Manchester, New Hampshire; and Boston, Massachusetts. As a result of the study of these cities Warren concluded that citizen participation changed the planning process anticipated by HUD and the goals which would be accomplished. In most of the cities there was no resident participation in the planning grant application period, but the planning period was dominated by residents struggling with city hall for varying degrees of control over the program. A number of Model Cities boards received funds to hire their own planning staffs.

Examples of formal prerogatives in decision-making include: veto power over Model Neighborhood programs won by boards in some cities; domination by neighborhood residents over task forces or planning committees in various substantive areas; in at least one instance, domination over the board of the Model Cities agency itself through a guaranteed majority of neighborhood residents on the board; and the expansion of decision-making prerogatives to include a strong voice or even a veto of other types of federally funded programs in the Model Neighborhood. 14

It should be remembered that at the time of designation

---

of the first round Model Cities there was a social movement in this country given impetus by the anti-poverty programs and Black Power. In many cities residents had experienced bargaining with city hall as a result of their involvement with other programs.

Cambridge

Cambridge had a population of nearly 100,000 in 1960; 16,000 of them were residents of what was to become the Model Neighborhood Area.

Since 1942 the city has operated under a city manager form of government, with a nine-man city council elected by proportional representation. In 1967 the salary of councillors was increased to $6,500; before that it was $4,000 per year. City managers are appointed by the council to administer the affairs of the city. There are no basic qualifications required for the job. There is no set time, minimum or maximum, for holding the job. Until 1965 there had been the same city manager for twenty years.
II. HISTORY OF PARTICIPATION IN
THE CAMBRIDGE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

New Department in City Hall

January 1966 brought leadership changes in the City of Cambridge. Daniel Hayes, former School Committeeman, was elected mayor by his fellow councilmen. Joseph De Guglielmo, former mayor and councilman, was appointed city manager by the City Council. The mayor appointed a Technical Task Force to deal with many of the problems facing Cambridge: including a shortage of low cost housing, the threat of a new highway through the city displacing families and businesses, and conflicting demands on the city from residents and two local institutions, Harvard and M.I.T.¹

Aside from the mayor and city manager, other members of the Task Force were Oliver Brooks, President of the Cambridge Corporation; Robert Rowland, Acting Director of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA); and representatives of Harvard and M.I.T. The Cambridge Corporation was founded in 1966, "to

¹Justin Gray provided the material for most of this chapter. He allowed me access to his personal unpublished papers, in addition to giving an interview. He provided information on the activities and attitudes of the city and his staff during the planning stages. Most of the other city and agency officials were not available for interviews because they have left their offices and the region.
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assist in the achievement of economic, physical, and social improvements in Cambridge." It is primarily supported by Harvard and M.I.T. and has a revolving fund of $1 million to provide temporary seed money for building projects, to finance community studies, and to "help finance other activities that can assist the growth and development of the City." 

One recommendation of the Task Force was the creation of an Office of Community Development. This office's purpose would be to coordinate the many fragmented planning activities in the city; the CRA, the City Planning Board, and the Housing Authority; and to "pick the federal pocket" for the city. Justin Gray was recommended by Oliver Brooks to head this department. Gray had years of experience in city and regional planning and urban renewal, and he was well known in planning circles. Rowland wanted the new department to be part of the CRA, but Gray demanded that if he was to head the department his title would have to be Assistant to the City Manager. This is the only way he felt he would have the independence and the influence he needed to accomplish the objectives of the department.

De Guglielmo got together a list of city leaders who supported Justin Gray and presented his recommendation that the department be approved and that Gray be hired to head it to the Cambridge Corporation Charter.

---

2 Cambridge Corporation Charter.
City Council. The support for this recommendation was so strong the council voted its approval.

Gray set out to get as much funding as possible for Cambridge. The Technical Task Force had recommended he seek Model Cities funds. Gray felt Cambridge was not prepared to go to HUD for these funds during the first round selection of cities. He proposed to wait for the second round. The urban renewal record in the city was poor; there was no long range planning in the city; the current data needed to complete an application were not available; and the competition with the large cities such as Chicago and New York would be difficult because by comparison Cambridge had fewer problems.

Instead Gray turned to private foundations for money to prepare an application. He expected to take a year to gather data, mobilize the community, and use the resources of Harvard and M.I.T. His proposal for funds was rejected by all the foundations he approached. They did not feel they should finance a project for the federal government. At the same time, Gray was warned by a friend in Washington that there might not be a second round due to the War in Vietnam and other federal priorities.

Selecting a Model Neighborhood

Gray decided to prepare an application for the first
round. Potential neighborhoods were the Cambridgeport-Riverside area and the neighborhoods with the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee (CEOC) designation of Neighborhoods 3 and 4 (or Area 3, Area 4). Cambridgeport and Riverside had rejected being urban renewal areas, and it was believed sentiment in the neighborhoods would not welcome designation as Model Cities Neighborhoods.

Neighborhoods 3 and 4 were chosen as the Model Neighborhood. Neighborhoods 3 and 4 already had community action programs. Part of Area 3 was the Cambridge Redevelopment Area. The city manager had appointed fifteen residents to the Wellington-Harrington Citizens Committee to advise the CRA. CEOC planning teams operated in both areas. Citizens in Area 4 had organized the Conference of Organizations, Blocks and Individuals (COBI) to develop a physical plan for their neighborhood. Gray believed that with the base of organizations existing in the neighborhoods and the addition of Model Cities many more funds would find their way into the area.

The neighborhood was also threatened by the proposed Inner Belt Highway. The highway was devised in 1948 with a route along Brookline and Elm Streets in the area. Residents in the neighborhood had already protested the highway, and the Model Cities program was seen by Gray as a means of stopping the highway. According to the Massachusetts Department of
Public Works' survey in June 1967, there are 638 dwelling units in the Model Cities area on the path of the Brookline-Elm alignment. The housing and business facilities along the route of the Inner Belt had deteriorated in maintenance because of the imminent threat of their demolition to make way for the highway. Fletcher School, built in 1903, and needing to be rebuilt, was also in the path of the proposed highway, and for this reason has not been replaced. The Save Our Cities Committee, a city wide organization to stop the highway, was strong in Areas 3 and 4.

The area also felt the threat of expansion by Harvard and M.I.T. Residents feared both the physical expansion of the schools and the influx of students from the schools competing with residents for housing in the neighborhood.

The area can be characterized as lower income and working class. It is essentially residential, with first and second generation Americans living there. The predominant architectural style is the three-decker framed house. There are three housing projects in the neighborhood: Roosevelt Towers, Washington Elms, and Newtowne Court. The projects contain 842 units or 25% of all housing units in the area.

---

3 Cambridge Model Cities, First Year Action Program, p. 9.

4 Interview with Peggy Faull.
There is also a small project for the elderly. It is believed that the percentage of owner occupied housing has decreased, but the 1960 census gives the figures of 50% owner occupied housing. 1970 census figures on the neighborhood are not available.

The neighborhood includes a diverse group of people. There are Italian-Americans, Lithuanian-Americans, Portuguese-Americans, Polish-Americans, Spanish-Americans and Afro-Americans in recognizable numbers. No overt hostility exists between these different people, and the diverse combination have lived in the neighborhood for many years.

However, there are racial and cultural antagonisms in the neighborhood. When a group of residents went to Washington, D.C. to fight a drug bill in 1972, every minority group had a bureau serving them, except the poor whites, and they asked where their office was. There is evidence that the poor whites feel they are being discriminated against in favor of blacks, locally and nationally.

The blacks in the neighborhood do not feel they have found an integrationist's dream world in the neighborhood. They have experienced racial bias in the neighborhood and still anticipate prejudice. Some have not forgotten their

---

5 Conversation with Billy Wood.
6 Interviews with Wally Brown, Lorraine Williams; conversation with Gail Bishop.
racial experiences in the South, though others have always lived in Cambridge.

The Spanish and Portuguese, as the newest arrivals in the neighborhood, have been put in the position of competing between themselves for Model Cities funds after the poor whites and blacks have taken their share.

There is an uneasiness between the people on welfare and the working class and the people who live in projects and the homeowners. The working class and the homeowners feel there is too much welfare and that welfare recipients who live in the Model Neighborhood are getting double subsidy. 7

Between the two neighborhoods, 3 and 4, there are long standing hostilities. Blacks, who have lived in Area 4 since before 1900, have only felt free to walk or live in Area 3 since the 1950s. Racial suspicions and tensions are more evident in Area 3. When Area 3 was designated an urban renewal area the housing project in the neighborhood, Roosevelt Towers, which contains the majority of the black population, was excluded from the renewal area, leaving only the Wellington-Harrington area. Area 3 has maintained its ethnic identity; Cambridge Street is lined with stores servicing Italians and Portuguese. This area has traditionally turned

7 Interview with Jerry Spelewski.
to the family and the church for social services. Area 4 has used the social services of the city and professionals, two settlement houses, and an active OEO planning team.

As shown in the table below, every index of social, economic, and physical problems indicates that the Model Neighborhood area has greater problems than the city as a whole. Residents of the area are disadvantaged in housing, education, health services, employment opportunities, and financial status.

Model Neighborhood Area: Socioeconomic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City Total</th>
<th>Model Neighborhood Area</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION DENSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units per Acre</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>U.S. Census of Housing: 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Units Over-crowded (more than one person per room)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>HC(3) - 183 Camb. Pl. Bd. Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Families</td>
<td>24,490</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>U.S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Families Income less than $3000</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>PHC(1) - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Income less than $3000 as % of total</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8Interviews with Sister Mary Griffin, Sister Loretta.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City Total</th>
<th>Neighborhood Area</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY INCOME, Cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Income less than $1000</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Income less than $1000 as % of total</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEMPLOYMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Such Males Who Are Unemployed</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>PHC(1) - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 14 and Over in Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>19,950</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Such Females Who Are Unemployed</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WELFARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Persons Under 21 Receiving AFDC Payments</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>PHC(1) - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Persons 65 and Over Receiving Old Age Assistance</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRIME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Persons Under 17 Years Old</td>
<td>23,394</td>
<td>4,695</td>
<td>U.S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Juvenile Arrests(^9)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>PHC(1) - 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\)Total number of juveniles brought to court.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City Total</th>
<th>Model Neighborhood Area</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CRIME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, Cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests as % of Persons Under 17 Years Old</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Court Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960 Camb. Arrest Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Persons 17 Years Old and Over</td>
<td>82,322</td>
<td>10,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Criminal Arrests per Year (excluding minor misdemeanors)</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Arrests as % of Persons 17 Years Old and Over</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Housing Units</td>
<td>35,330</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>U.S. Census of Housing: 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Housing Units Which Are Substandard</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>HC(3) - 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of All Housing Units Which Are Substandard</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Housing Units Which Are Dilapidated</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Housing Units Which Are Dilapidated</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Persons 14 and 15 Years Old</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>U.S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Persons 14 and 15 Years Old Enrolled in School</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>not avail.</td>
<td>PHC(1) - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Persons 16 and 17 Years Old</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item & City Total & Model Neighborhood Area & Source of Data \\
--- & --- & --- & --- \\
(EDUCATION, Cont.) & & & & \\
% of Persons 16 and 17 Years Old Enrolled in School & 79.1% & not avail. & & \\
Total Number of Persons 14 to 17 Years Old & 4,973 & 900 & & \\
% in High School & 90.0% & 82.2% & & \\
Total Number of Persons 25 Years Old and Over & 61,821 & 8,133 & & \\
% of Persons 25 and Over with Less than 8 Years of Education & 15.6% & 27.2% & & \\
HEALTH & & & & \\
Infant Deaths as Percent of Births Per Year & 3.0% & 4.4% Cambridge Health Dept. & & \\
Incidence of Tuberculosis per 1,000 Population & 0.4 & 0.6 & & \\

Applying for Model Cities Funds

Having made the decision to submit an application and having chosen a Model Neighborhood Area (MNA) Gray's staff had six weeks to complete an application to meet an April 1, 1967 HUD deadline. Justin Gray and Oliver Brooks prepared the application with the help of two of Gray's staff members, Bob Bowyer and Gordon Brigham. After consideration of the time restraints involved Gray decided to avoid any potential conflict
situations and to prepare an inhouse application with as little outside input as possible.

There was virtually no resident input. Gray says he told residents in effect, "Trust me, I know how to get federal money. Once we get it, I will bring you in all the way." No workshops or task forces were held with residents. The section on citizen participation was written by Dick Green, Vice President of the Cambridge Corporation.

Having completed the document Gray arranged a meeting with residents for March 17, to get their endorsement and to explain the Model Cities program. No issues were foreseen before the meeting, by Gray or his staff. However, a group of Area 4 residents saw Model Cities as another mechanism to clear land and remove poor people. Before the meeting they sent out flyers in the community urging residents to come and save their community.

The discussion in the meeting was hot and vocal. Residents voted not to support Model Cities until they were guaranteed control of all aspects of the program. Janet Rose, Lorraine Williams, and Helen Meehan, members of the Area 4 planning team, drafted a resolution for resident control with the help of a lawyer from legal aid. At the suggestion of Justin Gray a resident committee visited each of the nine city councillors individually to solicit their support for resident
control of the Model Cities program. On April 24, 1967 the City Council voted unanimously to approve the resident control resolution. After the vote residents caucused for an hour and a half, then authorized the City Council to prepare and submit the Model Cities program application, subject to resident conditions.

Three reasons are given for the vote of the city councillors. First, Justin Gray supported the residents to the point of threatening to resign, and second, the city manager and the mayor had already given their support to the program. Third, there was little hope Cambridge would be chosen as a Model City, because of its small size, its relatively few social problems, and its proximity to Boston, which most certainly would be chosen.

Announcements from HUD saying which cities had been chosen were expected in June of 1967. The announcement did not come until November 1967. During the seven months between submitting the application and hearing from HUD all activity in Cambridge on the Model Cities program stopped, because of the uncertainty of their being chosen. Though Gray was delighted with the acceptance of Cambridge's application he was disappointed to receive only $91,000 in planning funds rather than the $180,000 requested. When pressed for additional funds, HUD Regional Director Joseph Goldman said
all cities were cut substantially, and adjusted to their reduced budgets. Justin Gray, however, did not adjust and sought the additional funds.

Regional HUD offices assigned "lead men" to each of the Model Cities. These "lead men" were given day to day responsibility for the programs in their assigned cities. Linda Broderick was assigned to the Massachusetts cities of Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, and Springfield. She suggested Gray apply for 701 funds for Model Cities planning and for special HUD funds for particularly innovative proposals in each Model Cities region. Gray managed to get a total of $193,500; $91,000 from the original grant, plus $26,000 from the special grant, $30,000 from the City Redevelopment Program, and $46,500 from 701 funds.

Citizen Participation

After Cambridge was designated a Model City, a volunteer resident committee drafted an ordinance outlining resident demands. It took fourteen meetings for residents to draft the Model Neighborhood ordinance for Cambridge, City Ordinance #766. The city ordinance was distributed door to door in the neighborhood and published in the Cambridge Chronicle. Justin Gray hired 40 neighborhood residents at $2 an hour and trained them as canvassers. A referendum took two
weeks and was highly successful. 4,558 voted out of 6,500 eligible resident voters in the MNA; 4,469 of them voted in favor. The City Council then passed the ordinance unanimously.

The ordinance was completed on March 29, 1968 and passed the City Council on May 20, 1968. The significant aspects of the ordinance relating to citizen participation were as follows:

1. The CDA would be composed of twenty-four members, 16 of those members to be neighborhood residents, 8 from each neighborhood.

2. The Cambridge City Council, the Cambridge School Committee, the Cambridge City Manager, the Cambridge Housing Authority, the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, the academic institutions of higher learning in Cambridge, Model Neighborhood businesses, and social service agencies were to select the eight nonresident representatives from among their membership.

3. Board members were to serve for two years. Residents were given the right to recall board members they had elected.

4. The CDA could select, hire, discharge, and set the terms of employment for its staff, employees, and consultants subject to the approval of the City Manager for Community Development. Residents were to be hired whenever possible.

5. Model Cities funds could only be spent with the approval of the CDA board.

6. All city agencies were required to carry out the programs submitted to them by the CDA which were part of its properly approved plans.

7. The CDA was given the exclusive rights to plan and provide for the carrying out of the Cambridge Model Cities Program.10

10 Interview with Helen Meehan and Justin Gray.
Helen Meehan says members of the ordinance committee wanted a city ordinance to safeguard their rights to community control over all aspects of the Model Cities programs. The residents were given the right to veto the Model Cities program in their neighborhood. Residents dominated the planning committee for Model Cities; residents dominated the City Demonstration Agency board through the guarantee of a resident majority on the board; and the residents won the right to final decisions on any other federally funded programs in the Model Neighborhood.

Of later significance was the city solicitor's reaction to the ordinance. He said the ordinance was not legal, in that it usurped the powers of the city manager under the city charter. He referred specifically to the clause which states the CDA may "hire, fire, etc." The residents won their point because the city charter also states the city manager shall not have the power to hire or fire employees "of any body popularly elected by the voters of the City."

The election of the 16 resident members of the CDA board was the next order of business. The requirements for running for the board were residency in the MNA and being 18, if a member of a family unit, and 21 if not. Residents were innovative in giving eighteen year olds the right to vote and participate in the program. The clause "member of a 'family
unit'" was added to exclude participation by the student population.

Thirty-one people were listed on the ballot: 20 from Neighborhood 4 and 11 from Neighborhood 3. The low turnout of candidates in the latter area is explained by the fact that residents in Area 3 were involved in the Wellington-Harrington urban renewal project, and saw Model Cities as of secondary importance.

The elections were held for three days; there were two stationary polls and one mobile unit in each area. 2,407 votes were cast representing 40% of the eligible voters.

Jerry Spilewski of Area 4 received the largest vote. He is owner of a good-sized supermarket in the MNA and a homeowner. He served on the board of directors of one of the two settlement houses in the area.

Of the sixteen residents elected, three were black: Janet Rose, Reverend Graham, and Lorraine Williams. Janet was and still is president of the Area 4 CEOC planning team. Lorraine Williams was a member of the planning team and moved from secretary to director of the Margaret Fuller Settlement House. Reverend Graham has since moved from Cambridge to pastor another church. He pastored a storefront church and was custodian at a local bank.

Helen Meehan of Area 4 and Rita Camirand of Area 3 were two other old leaders elected. Mrs. Meehan was active in the
settlement houses, COBI, and the planning team. Mrs. Camirand was an officer of the planning team in her area.

Eight of the 46 who had served on the drafting committee for the CDA were elected. This figure may be misleading, because several nuns and husband and wife teams served on the drafting committee. At that time nuns were not running for elective office in the neighborhood.

Justin Gray says he was determined he would not "baptize existing organizations," but make efforts to get new representation and new leadership for the program. To do this he made no coalitions with existing agencies. However members of CEOC planning teams are heavily represented on the board and staff of Model Cities. No effort is made to list the names of board members because there were always changes in the board, due to people moving out of the area, or resigning for personal or political reasons. When this occurs the person from the area with the next highest vote takes the vacant seat. Later in the paper there is a discussion of leaders of long term standing.

It is interesting to note at this point that on July 1, 1968 the city council hired a new city manager, James L. Sullivan, following the "political" firing of Joseph De Guglielmo. Sullivan was a professional manager. He unprecedentedly attended City Council meetings, he pledged to coordinate the city's planning, he advocated resident
involvement, and appointed himself to the CDA board as the representative from his office.

Justin Gray acted as temporary CDA Director until staff were hired. During the early board meetings there were tensions between residents of Area 3 and Area 4. Elected members were hostile to appointed board members. Appointed board members included Al Velucci, a city councillor and a resident of the MNA from Area 3; and Howard Johnson, President of M.I.T. Residents were learning Robert's rules of order. Bylaws were passed reflecting the city ordinance.

Jerry Spilewski was elected chairman, Rita Camirand, vice chairman; and Lorraine Williams was elected corresponding secretary.

Gordon Brigham was hired by the board to be the CDA Director. Brigham was a member of Gray's staff and Gray maneuvered to have him hired. Gray was convinced Brigham would do a good job and that, in any case, it would be difficult to find another top notch director.

During the summer of 1968 the board had open board members. The board occupied itself with administrative tasks and residents in the audiences complained all the board did was talk.

Next the board hired a community organizer. They were aware only a small percentage of the 16,000 people in the neighborhood were active in or even aware of the Model Cities
program. On October 23, James Donovan was hired as a community organizer. Donovan had worked at CEOC in this capacity and had support on the board from members active in CEOC planning teams. Brigham, when asked to comment on which of the candidates before the board he preferred, refused to do so. This was typical of Brigham; he left all decisions to the board and gave as little direction as he could.

At the October 23 meeting, Linda Broderick announced HUD officials in Washington were uneasy about the future of Model Cities. (National elections were in November.) She suggested in order to get funds it would be advisable to complete their planning documents by December 20, the anniversary of their planning year. They had planned to take seven to eight months to complete plans. The board accepted the recommendations.

The city manager declared November "Model Cities Month," and instructed all city offices to give top priority to work for Model Cities. In order to meet the nine-week deadline residents had to give up the right of absolute control of the planning process. The board did attend almost nightly meetings to review all sections of the plans, to participate in community workshops on various programs to go into the submission, and to prepare for a neighborhood referendum. Brigham scheduled all meetings and the writing of the plan. He borrowed people from public and private agencies
to write the draft. There were 29 proposed first-year projects. In the referendum for the draft proposal 3000 residents voted: 2639 in favor, 142 against, an 18 to 1 margin. They met their deadline and the Cambridge City Council and HUD accepted the planning document. $1,530,000 was 175% of the $870,000 Cambridge expected to get. The greater amount was given because Cambridge was designated an "accelerated city" by HUD. HUD saw special potential in the Cambridge program.

Loss of Resident Control

During 1969 the CDA board was busy trying to implement its program for the year. All staff for the program were hired by the resident controlled board. Staff salaries and program allocations were also determined by the board. The CDA decided on five areas of program activity referred to by the agency as "components." The components were Housing, Employment and Economic Development; Education; Social Services, Health, and Recreation; and Municipal Services. Cambridge Model Cities planned to distribute HUD supplemental funds for the first action year in the following way:
In each category at least half of the funds should be assumed to be for administrative costs, including salaries and supplies.

Among the programs Model Cities funded were:

- Training of resident teacher aids through the city schools;
- Elderly drop-in programs; teen centers; a day care center with priority given to welfare mothers seeking employment; community schools to keep the schools open in the evening and in the summer to provide recreation and education for children and adults; the Neighborhood Family Care Center, a free preventive medical center for all ages; planting trees in the neighborhood; recreation programs through the city recreation department to provide activities for neighborhood children.

---

11 Interview with Jerry Spelewski.

12 Based on estimate by Jack Millet, Controller, Cambridge Model Cities.
Funds were provided to pay tuition for resident Model Cities staff members to further their education and increase their job skills. 312 loans and 115 grants were processed for local homeowners through Model Cities.

The major regret of resident leaders was that all programs had to be subcontracted. Resident leaders did not feel this provision allowed them enough innovation and flexibility in program content. HUD's requirement that Model Cities subcontract all programs was to increase the coordination of efforts of existing agencies; federal, state, local, and private; rather than add to the number of agencies.

Near the end of the Second Action Year a showdown between HUD, the city and Model Cities occurred. The Nixon administration clarified the federal intent that ultimate control and responsibility for the operation of Model Cities programs should be with the local government body. Deputy Assistant Secretary Baida made a public statement that

\[\ldots\text{ it was the intent, and, in fact, a statutory requirement of Congress, that local government assume responsibility and exert adequate leadership to assure the involvement and commitment of local public and private agencies and institutions in a coordinated and cooperative local effort} \ldots\text{ while providing that representative citizen groups have meaningful and direct access to decision making}.\]

The confrontation between the CDA board and the City

\[^{13}\text{Di Nunzio, p. 41.}\]

\*Helen Meehan.
of Cambridge began on December 2, 1970. The CDA board requested that all Model Cities staff receive an eleven percent cost of living raise. City employees were receiving an eight percent cost of living raise, but the board felt Model Cities employees should receive the higher wage because they did not receive the employee benefits given to city employees. The board set salary levels, but the city was responsible for authorizing the dispersal of all monies in the agency. The city manager refused to accept the board’s recommendation, and to execute two program contracts. For the first time the city manager had absolutely refused to comply with a request made by the CDA board. Confrontation and press conferences were held throughout the winter. In April 1971 HUD officials entered the controversy demanding a settlement be reached before HUD would review the submission by Cambridge Model Cities for third-year funds. The demands were in a letter dated May 5, 1971 from HUD to the city manager’s office.

HUD requires the organization include the following points:

1. Clearly defined relationship between the city, the CDA board, and the CDA administrative structure.

2. Restructuring of the CDA staff so there is a line relationship from the component director, and, therefore, some opportunity for each director to direct. (The board hired the staff for each component, rather than the director of the component, doing this.)
3. Indication of city support and direction for the Model Cities program.

4. Increased viable and widespread citizen participation and program planning and evaluation. Continuous communications between Model Neighborhood residents and their representatives on the board.

The reorganization of Cambridge Model Cities was complete by June of 1971, in time for the Third Action Year submission. The reorganization allowed the CDA board to hire the Model Cities director, but all other employees were to be hired by the director with the consent of the city manager. The city manager was made responsible for all funds spent by the Model Cities program.

In the reorganization the CDA lost the power of complete control of the Model Cities program. The board had been responsible for developing bylaws, for hiring directors, for interviewing and choosing staff members, and for developing and approving programs. The board had final say over projects, staff, and budgets. With the reorganization the board found themselves in an advisory capacity. They were given the right to review all plans, policies, programs, proposals, budgets and contracts relating to the Model Cities program. Their recommendations to the city manager could then be accepted or rejected.

With the change from the Johnson to the Nixon administration there was a change of personnel in the local
offices of HUD. Under the Johnson administration a Mr. Grossman was Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary, and he encouraged the citizen's control in the Cambridge program, calling it "unique." Charles Frankel took over Mr. Grossman's job during the Nixon administration and said that Cambridge could not be an exception to the intent of the Model Cities guidelines.

Justin Gray had moved from the city manager's office to his own consulting firm. The support he gave to citizen control during the organization of Cambridge Model Cities was not available during the reorganization. Bob LeBlanc, who became the city manager's representative with the CDA, was believed to be anti-resident control by Helen Meehan, Peggy Faull, and Janet Rose. By 1970 John Corcoran had replaced Sullivan as Cambridge city manager. Corcoran pushed for city control of the Model Cities program.

Jordan Brigham resigned as director in December 1969. Robert Williams and James Goggin were hired by the board as director and deputy director respectively in January 1970. They had both worked with a community action program in Pittsburgh before coming to Cambridge. In January 1971 the board asked the two men to submit their resignations by March 1971. Peggy Cavallaro, a resident board member, in speaking for the board, said board members did not trust the two men and were not able to work compatibly with them. She said the
board was not satisfied with Williams' method of hiring and firing personnel. The legal advisor to the board, James Ferrel, became Acting Director.

On all levels, federal, city, and Model Cities, key administration posts had changed hands. During the reorganization process there was no protest movement or outcry from the community as a whole.

Resident leaders in the Model Neighborhood were never satisfied with the reorganization settlement. In an effort to soften the blow they incorporated themselves and became a subcontracting agent to Model Cities. The citizen group, known as C.D.A., Inc., is subcontracted to provide citizen planning and evaluation of Model Cities' programs. C.D.A., Inc. has a $182,000 budget and a staff of eight for the Third Action Year (1971-72). The staff includes a citizen participation coordinator, and administrative assistant to the director of citizen participation; a secretary-receptionist; a communication specialist, responsible for publishing the Model Cities newspaper and getting out press releases; and three community organizers. C.D.A., Inc. has purchased a three-story brick structure in the Model Neighborhood to house its staff and officers.

Resident leaders feel by incorporating they will be able to get both government and private funds, and not be dependent on the City of Cambridge for funding and programming. Helen Meehan regrets not having taken HUD and the City of Cambridge to court over the issue of resident control of the Model Cities program. Despite their many criticisms of the interference by HUD and the city, resident leaders remain active in the Model Cities program. They have a renewed determination to control the events in their neighborhood and to work with the city and HUD on the terms of the residents. Their experiences did not completely alienate resident leaders from federal and local governments. Residents are aware of the financial rewards of cooperating with these agencies.

In other Model Cities programs the boards of planning councils have used funds to hire their own staffs. In Dayton the planning council hired its own technical staff. OEO funds have been given to enable residents to hire their own staff in the Model Cities program. I know of no other program where residents incorporated or became a separate entity.

Helen Meehan is very proud of the incorporation and keeps the charter on her desk. Neighborhood residents were not

15 Interview with Helen Meehan.
16 Hallman, p. 194.
consulted about the incorporation, and were officially informed in the Model Cities' newspaper, "The Communicator."

The events during the planning for the Neighborhood Facilities Grant give background for the long term effect of the reorganization on how resident leaders continue to participate in Cambridge Model Cities.
IV. CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN PLANNING FOR 
THE NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES GRANT APPLICATION 

Introduction 

During the Spring of 1971 Cambridge Model Cities received a letter from the regional HUD office with information about the Neighborhood Facilities Grant (NFG) program. HUD encouraged Cambridge Model Cities to consider submitting an application, stating funds were available and Model Cities programs would receive priorities in application review.

HUD launched the Neighborhood Facilities program in 1965. The facilities were to make health, recreational, and welfare services more accessible to low income families. The enabling legislation is contained in section 703. For a neighborhood to be eligible for the program, 50% of the families in the neighborhood must earn less than $3000, or 33.3% must be below the poverty levels in areas where there is a CAP in operation.

The letter was referred to Michael Appleby, Director of Comprehensive Planning, Cambridge Model Cities. With the assistance of a design class from M.I.T.'s Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP), Mr. Appleby did the preliminary investigations to determine if there was a need for such a facility, and if there was underused or unused space in the
neighborhood on which to build a facility. After the preliminary investigation Mr. Appleby presented positive findings to the CDA board. The findings showed agencies in the neighborhood had insufficient space which restricted the extent and the quality of their services. There were a number of underused buildings and lots throughout the neighborhood to locate such a facility. Based on Mr. Appleby's recommendation the CDA board unanimously agreed to allot $35,332 for preparing an application.

In June 1971 Mr. Appleby hired four M.I.T. graduate students to work during the summer to prepare the application. Two of the students were from the Architecture Department and two of the students were from DUSP. I was one of the students from DUSP. Already having done preliminary site investigation, we prepared a schedule taking us through September 1971, and set out to prepare the application. We prepared the following schedule of meetings with the neighborhood.

**NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES GRANT PROJECT**

Cambridge Model Cities

**TASK FORCE ORGANIZATION**

Tentative Meeting Schedule

**Meeting I**

- Project Introduction
- Explanation of what the TASK FORCE is about
- The duties of the TASK FORCE
- Introduction of the agencies being considered
- Explanation of possible management systems
- Review of site analysis used
- Proposal of site
- Distribution of Client Information Forms
* Mail out site summaries
Monday 26  
MEETING II  
- Final site selection by TASK FORCE  
- Presentation of contract for management systems  
- Collection of Client Information Forms

Thursday 29  
MEETING III  
- Discussion of arrangement and combination of agencies  
- Final Commitment of Agencies  
- Designation of nonprofit sponsor

Wednesday 4 August  
MEETING IV  
- Presentation of the Design Program for the facility  
- Facility

Monday 16 August  
MEETING V  
- Preliminary Design Presentation

Monday 23 August  
MEETING VI  
- Final Design Presentation  
- Conclusion to Application

Note: The dates indicated in this schedule were not followed precisely. Although the outline was generally fulfilled, meetings often did not occur on the dates stated here.

Our plan for the first month was to visit all agencies in the neighborhood to determine the extent of their space needs, their location priorities, and their design requirements. Simultaneously we gathered financial and legal information on the possible site. While the design team did this work it was proposed that the Model Cities citizen participation staff would organize a task force of residents interested in the concept of a neighborhood facility.
Citizen Participation Component

We approached Lorraine Williams, the director of the Citizen Participation (CP) staff, to ask her to organize a task force for planning a facility. Lorraine was never available to help us. Later we found there were many reasons for her lack of cooperation. Funds for the Citizen Participation staff were running low during the summer and the staff eventually had to be released because there was no money for their salaries. In addition a job description had never been established for the Citizen Participation staff. Rather than acting as organizers, Lorraine describes the CP staff as "fire trucks following the excitement." Whenever there was an eviction or a disgruntled group of residents the CP staff went to the scene. It was the CP's staff's belief that each component was responsible for their own organization of residents. This was the case even though all component directors were not residents of the neighborhood, and therefore, unfamiliar with individuals, groups, or historical events.

Prior to the emergence of the resident control issue, there was little definition as to the role, meaning, and purpose of the Citizen Participation Component. The CP staff had no programs nor plans of a long range nature nor a

---

1 Interview with Lorraine Williams.
framework for day-to-day operation. Day-to-day operations suffered in the absence of objectives, goals, policies, structure, and direction. Neither Mr. Appleby nor the design team were aware the CP staff had never been prepared to function in the manner we had requested. CP had never directed itself to communication with individual residents and could not help us tap resident input from residents interested in a community facility.

The reorganization eventually put the CP staff directly accountable to the CDA board. The board was given the responsibility of hiring all CP staff and the staff is responsible only to the board. Because the CDA board is no longer responsible for the entire operation of Model Cities, greater concentration can be given to developing CP. The planning goals, purposes, and programs of the CP staff are more clearly defined and CP has full-time management internal to itself. A mechanism for resident input was tied with the CP staff. It was unfortunate that a citizen's group priding themselves on resident control should have had to rely on outsiders to organize residents around an issue effecting their neighborhood, such as the proposed facility.

Conflicts with the Neighborhood Family Care Center

Our disappointment with not receiving the cooperation of the CP staff was soon accompanied by our surprise with the
antagonism we encountered when approaching the agency we had hoped would be the facility's primary tenant, the Neighborhood Family Care Center (NFCC). NFCC had the reputation of being a resident controlled organization, offering excellent services in an inadequate facility. Because of resident support of NFCC; its reputation in the community as a good provider of services, including preventive medical care for the entire family, family counselling, and psychiatric treatment; and NFCC's need for better facilities, the design team felt NFCC would make an excellent primary tenant. NFCC's presence in the facility would hopefully enhance the facility's reputation in the neighborhood and attract residents to the facility. We also believed NFCC's position as a tenant in the facility would influence the CDA board to support the application we were preparing, because several resident were on both the CDA board and the NFCC board.

The reorganization of Cambridge Model Cities giving control to the City of Cambridge was fresh in NFCC board members' minds. The HUD requirement that the proposed neighborhood facility must be controlled by the local public body, the City of Cambridge, was considered to be another threat to the sovereignty of resident control.

The HUD requirement that the city own and be responsible for the facility was beyond our control. HUD has been pushing the neighborhood facility program in the direction of
a city hall program. HUD would like to see city halls responsible for the full funding and operation of such facilities. We could only tell the NFCC people that because Model Cities rather than City Hall was providing the local funding for the facility, City Hall was not likely to demand complete control over the operation of the facility. The design team promised to make every effort to see that a nonprofit organization, perhaps NFCC, was permitted to run the facility.

Confusion was also caused by the design team's use of terms in describing the proposed facility. In discussion and writing the facility was referred to as the neighborhood facility and the multi-service center. The Neighborhood Family Care Center's previous name had been the Multi-Service Center. NFCC thought the proposed facility was to duplicate their idea and take over NFCC's state and Model Cities funding sources.

We attempted to emphasize the guidelines' definition of an eligible facility as being:

**ELIGIBLE FACILITIES.** Program assistance is limited to multipurpose facilities. A multipurpose facility is one which provides a wide range of services such as health, welfare, recreational, cultural, social and other similar community services (including a Community Action Program) needed in the area. A facility devoted predominately to health or recreation, for example, is not considered multipurpose.

---

2 For a full discussion of the relationship HUD would like to see between facilities and city halls see "'Neighborhood Facilities' Program is Beginning to Show," *Journal of Housing*, No. 3, March, 1968, pp. 130-141.
The services to be provided must be new or must improve or expand upon those already existing in the neighborhood. Existing levels of needed social services in other parts of the community should be maintained. It was impossible to convince NFCC we were not conspiring with the city to take over control of NFCC. Peggy Faull and Pat McCarthy, who are on both the CDA and NFCC boards, and Jackie Carroll, chairman of the NFCC board, lead NFCC's refusal to be involved in the planning of the proposed facility.

It was also at this point residents had reached the pinnacle of their suspicions of professionals. The executive director and the deputy director of Model Cities had been fired by the board. The CDA board members were searching for their third director in four years. Three of the six component directors were asked to resign that summer. NFCC because of its close connections with the Model Cities program was very suspicious of the intents of Mr. Appleby in regard to the proposed facility.

They had visions of the city taking complete control of the proposed facility and the programs of the tenant agencies. The Design Team and Mr. Appleby were surprised at the hostile and negative reaction of the NFCC to the suggestion that the city would have to own the proposed facility. Mr. Appleby began working for Cambridge Model 3 Neighborhood Facilities Grant Program Guidelines, Chapter 3, p. 5.
Cities in December 1970. Though he was employed during the reorganization his experience dealing with various resident personalities was limited. Because he was working in good faith the suspicions of the residents were unexpected.

The design team was not only stigmatized by being professionals, but also by being from M.I.T. The Model Cities Ordinance by including a representative from the institutions of higher learning in Cambridge, tended to use the resources of Harvard and M.I.T. professors and students. Unfortunately, most residents saw M.I.T. students as causing rents in the Model Cities Neighborhood to be increased to a rate long time residents were unable to pay or M.I.T. students asking to interview people for papers. The building of Tech Square on land in the Model Neighborhood was another sore point with residents. When resident leaders became interested in the Task Force we heard as much about the ripoffs by M.I.T. as about planning for the facility. Francis H., former CDA board chairman and presently on the Model Cities staff, describes the CDA board as intent on planning against these institutions (Harvard and M.I.T.)

Despite their need for space NFCC was firmly opposed to the proposed facility. NFCC board members, being largely from Area 4, encouraged other residents of Area 4 not to

4 Interview with Francis Hayes.
involve themselves in the planning for the proposed facility. They insisted the proposed facility have no medical services or any duplication of the services provided by the NFCC. The HUD guidelines require there be no duplication of services and there were no conflicts between the wishes of the NFCC and the design team.\(^5\)

**Organization of Task Force**

After recuperating from the setbacks caused by the CP staff and the NFCC, the design team began organizing a task force in July 1971. Because the design team was completely unfamiliar with the neighborhood it was very difficult to organize people, especially in light of the influence of the NFCC boycott. The Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA), located in Area 3, was helpful in organizing residents of Area 3 and arranging meetings in that area. The most successful Task Force meeting in terms of numbers of people and decisions reached occurred in Area 3. The CRA had a professional citizen participation staff.

Aside from the normal delays of community participation, progress went along fairly smoothly until after the selection of sites. Conflicts occurred because some residents did not understand the grant was for construction of a service center.

\(^5\)See Exhibit I for minutes of meetings between the design team and NFCC board and staff members.
only. Many felt the money should go toward upgrading the services. Another conflict arose because of the differentiation between Area 3 and Area 4. Each area wanted the center located in their area. Funds were not available for two facilities. A compromise was made to have the facility on the border between the two areas.

Review of Task Force by Area 4 Planning Team

In August, 1971 a site was selected for the neighborhood facility. Shortly after the site was announced residents of Area 4, including NFCC and CDA board members, began protesting the decisions made by the Task Force, because of what they termed improper representation. The criticisms were that residents of Area 4 had not been properly notified of Task Force meetings and too many of the Task Force meetings were held in Area 3. The very people who were the first to be contacted about the proposed facility complained they were not informed of Task Force activities and unable to attend meetings three blocks from their homes. Major complaints were lodged by Lorraine W., who as director of the Citizen Participation staff should have taken the initiative to organize the Task Force.

Billy W., a resident staff member who shared an office with the design team and was aware of our progress, and the time and place of all Task Force meetings.
Jackie C., Chairman of the NFCC board and one of the first people informed of the organization of a Task Force. Her husband also shared an office with the design team.

Janet R. and Peggy F., members of the CDA board and on the Task Force mailing list.

Pat M., as a CDA and NFCC board member, was well informed of the progress of the application.

The problem was these people were in a frustrating situation. They felt they had been stripped of their powers by the city and HUD. Their lack of success with hiring staff was evidenced by the high staff turnover at the professional level due to releases and resignations. Some of the projects they have sponsored in the past, especially in the housing program, were obvious failures. While these resident leaders were being cautious and not becoming involved in the facility planning, other residents had taken the initiative and made decisions.

The resident leaders were shocked to find other residents making decisions and shocked to find these decisions were considered valid. They attacked the validity of these decisions by insisting residents of Area 4 had not been included in the planning of the facility and insisting on review.

Throughout the summer the design team had tried to establish criteria for what citizen participation was. Often after sending thousands of notices to residents and announcing
meetings in newspapers and on radio only three to ten residents would attend meetings. We were aware more residents of Area 3 were active in the Task Force than residents of Area 4. We considered this to be by choice, because we made special efforts to contact Area 4 residents. We also knew established resident leaders were not active in the Task Force, and we wondered if only valid participation came from the leaders. We read and reread the neighborhood Facilities Grant guidelines for citizen participation to see how far we had to go with citizen participation. We saw no end in sight for meetings with residents and very few decisions being made. The guidelines were no help, because they were intentionally vague. The guidelines said communication and cooperation of residents should be strengthened and that residents should be involved in the planning phase.  

There were moral and practical considerations. Morally we felt it necessary to include as many residents as interested in the planning of the proposed facility. Practically we knew we must court individual resident leaders, especially CDA board members if we hoped to get official neighborhood approval. The question was who and how many? By August the design team realized our schedule for completion of
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6 Neighborhood Facilities Grant "Guidelines on Citizen Participation," Chapter 4, p. 17.
the application was impossible, because of the citizen participation factor. We further realized we could not ignore Area 4 demands for review, because these people were on the CDA board or influenced the CDA board, and we wanted to have board approval before submitting the application to HUD. We were looking for approval of the application by the Task Force, the CDA board, the City Council, and HUD, in that order, to fulfill the requirement of citizen approval.

In September 1971 the design team began meeting with the residents of Area 4, primarily members of the Area 4 planning team. Right away they were upset to discover the site for the proposed facility was owned by the CRA. The project which is the greatest embarrassment to Model Cities, the Willow Street Homes Project, is located on CRA land. The Willow Street project contains 15 units of housing for low income tenants. This housing was started in 1970 and is still unoccupied, because of disagreements between the CRA and the CDA, over materials and cost of construction. The CRA is not trusted in Area 4 and the residents wanted to choose another site for the facility. Lorraine Williams described the CRA as "always tearing things down," and Janet Rose, as chairman of the CDA housing component had entered into the agreement with the CRA to build housing on a site owned by the CRA. The fact

7See Exhibit II for minutes of meeting with Area 4 planning team.
that this housing is not occupied one year after the Spring 1971 expected date of occupancy is very disturbing to Janet and to her reputation in the neighborhood. Residents have threatened to take squatters' rights on the housing.

After communications back and forth between the CRA and the Area 4 planning team, as well as an agreement with Mr. Appleby to work on a second neighborhood facility to be located in Area 4, approval was given to the proposed facility. The Area 4 planning team raised the following points in its letter to the CRA.

1. How will the site be transferred to any applicant or a sponsor; in what price range?
   a. on what basis can title be revoked?

2. At what points during the design and construction of the facility will the CRA exercise its review function?
   a. in each stage what will the review involve; on what basis will the review be made?
   b. on what basis will design modifications be decided upon?
   c. in what cases would the review role lead to modification of design or stoppage of construction work?
   d. what relationship with the site will the CRA require once the facility construction is complete? For how long?
   e. under what conditions would the CRA ask that the site be returned?8

Evidently they received a satisfactory response.

Resident leaders in Area 4 wanted to display their power and show that they could not be ignored. They considered
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8 Letter from Alfred Carroll, Jr., Vice Chairman, Area 4 Planning Team, to Robert Rowland, Executive Director, CRA, October, 1971.
nonleaders and particularly residents of Area 3 to be politically naive and a need to review decisions made by this group. Area 4 leaders in all probability never considered completely rejecting the decisions made by the Task Force, because this would have meant a display or resident display.

The documentation of Task Force meeting, Task Force announcements, and mailing lists was so complete it was impossible for Area 4 residents to continue their complaints too long without being embarrassed. When they first began to complain the only complete copy of community involvement data mysteriously disappeared from the office. The material was gone for two weeks and mysteriously reappeared in the office. Based on circumstantial evidence the design team had a prime suspect. Fortunately, the material was returned to our office, after a month.

In all my interviews the existence of hostilities between residents of Area 3 and Area 4 were denied. But it definitely exists, especially among Area 4 residents. Area 4 residents protested having meetings in Area 3, or even having meetings at all between the two areas. When Task Force members from Area 3 agreed to meet the planning team of Area 4 in Area 4, Janet Rose expressed surprise and said she would never have agreed to a meeting in Area 3. Mrs. Rose wanted the design team to arrange two separate meetings, one for each area. All but one chairman of the Model Cities board have been from
Area 4. The board chairmen have been:

Jerry Spelewski, who is about fifty and unmarried. He is owner of a home and a family grocery store in the neighborhood.

Wally Brown, who is about forty and retired from the army. He is married and the father of four. He lives in a housing project in Area 3 and was a leader of the Tenant Senate.

Helen Meehan is a welfare mother who has always been active in neighborhood organizations. She has seven children.

All the resident leaders from Area 3 live in the housing projects, which indicates they live in Area 3 by chance not by choice. Area 3 is part of both the Cambridge Redevelopment Area and the Model Cities area. Because the CRA existed before the CDA Area 3 residents are more involved in the former organization. Residents of both areas often complain the other area is getting a greater share of the services and programs. Model Cities funds for recreation were stopped because it was believed by some board member Area 3 received a disproportionate share of the funds.\(^9\)

In my interviews after final resident and CDA approval of the final application the people who gave us the greatest headaches spoke of the proposed facility with the highest esteem and pride. The location of the facility, the tenant agencies; and the management system are all perfectly

\(^9\)CDA Board Meeting; Minutes, #66, September 23, 1970.
acceptable. Six months before everything in the planning of the facility was undesirable to these same people. There were comments that the task force was poorly organized, but it was felt that the design team had good intentions.

The major reason for this aboutface was the realization among resident leaders there was little physical improvement in the Model Neighborhood ten million dollars and four years after the program began in Cambridge. Other residents were unable to see where the money had been spent and who had benefited from the program. They began to ask questions. The facility would be an easily visible new structure in the middle of the neighborhood. Helen M., the present chairman of the CDA board, had received reports of the physical rehabilitation taking place in other Model Cities programs and indicated an interest in seeing a "monument" in Cambridge's Model Neighborhood.

There was little dispute over the final selection of agencies or of a management system. Many agencies were eliminated because they required more space than three hundred thousand dollars could supply. The agencies selected were noncontroversial types serving children and young people in the neighborhood. The design team expected the decision of management system to be time consuming.

---

10 For a report on resident criticisms of the Cambridge Model Cities Program, see the Christian Science Monitor, Second Section, August 1, 1970, "A Model-City Plan Takes Off Slowly,"
Residents were acceptable, however, to having the city own the facility and Cambridge Headstart, Inc. manage the facility. Provisions were made for a resident board.

The difficulty in getting resident approval of the application was not the only strain on the design team. The preparation of the application itself was very involved and time consuming. Delays in preparation of the application meant funds available on the regional HUD level for financing a facility were lessened. We began the project with visions of a million dollar facility and ended the project with barely enough HUD and local funds for a three hundred thousand dollar facility. We lived with the realization that after dozens of task force meetings, salaries for six staff members, plus consultant fees for architects and structural engineers and production of a three hundred page application; the application could have been rejected outright by HUD. Our reservation for funds would then have been withdrawn and we would have had nothing to show for all the time and money. The application has not received its final acceptance from HUD, but HUD has been helpful in working out an acceptable application with Model Cities. The Task Force, the Model Cities board, and the City Council have all given their approval to the application.
V. PROFILE OF RESIDENT "ACTIVISTS"

There are approximately thirty Model Neighborhood residents who are activists in the community.¹ Activists are residents who have been elected by other residents to represent them on citizens' boards in the neighborhood or who influence decisions affecting the neighborhood because of long term involvement with social agencies serving the neighborhood. Throughout my interviews with residents and staff involved with Model Cities I asked them to list the residents they considered to be most active in the program. Based on these lists and my evaluations I have composed a list of "activists."

In order to get approval of any program in Model Cities it is necessary to have the sponsorship of these people. They are a tight group who form coalitions among themselves. Almost all of these people were involved in citizen groups or community groups before the advent of Model Cities.

Even before the Model Cities, there was considerable citizen participation in programs for community action. Planning Teams under the auspices of the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee, funded by CEO, operate in both Neighborhoods 3 and 4, concerning themselves with the administration of the anti-poverty program. The Wellington-Harrington Citizens' Committee, appointed by City Council, has dominated

¹See Appendix A for a list of activists and their community involvements.
the planning of their urban renewal area, stressing the development of low-rise, low-cost housing. In Neighborhood 4, a voluntary citizens' association called the conference of Organizations, Blocks and Individuals (COBI) took the initiative, before Model Cities planning began, to coordinate citizen groups to seek solutions to their community problems. With the beginning of the Model Cities program, leaders in these citizen groups found a new channel for their own energies.2

Their involvement with Model Cities is a combination of at least two of the following: being on the drafting committee of Model Cities, being on the board of Model Cities for a minimum of two action years, or being employed by Model Cities or a Model Cities funded agency. In addition to direct Model Cities involvement these people are also on boards or members of other neighborhood organizations. Whenever a special task is organized some of these people are invited to participate. In fact, if the activists are not represented on a task force, committee, or organization they feel there is no validity to a decision made by these groups.

Francis Hayes, a former Model Cities board chairman and presently on the Model Cities staff, stated in his interview that the grave mistake in organizing for the Neighborhood Facility Task Force was the exclusion of the activists. He is one of the activists, and though he has the academic qualifications to find good employment outside of Model Cities he has chosen to work there and makes critical
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statements about other activists. (All the people
interviewed had some criticism of either the activists or the
program itself.) He says there is not a willingness for
activists to step aside for new citizen participants. In
fact, there is competition between the old and the new
citizen participants. In addition Francis Hayes feels there
is no place for activists to use their skills after being
educated through participation. They remain involved with
Model Cities. A feeling of unchallenged power is what keeps
the activists involved. There is a definite prejudice in
terms of prior participation, and an attitude that old
leaders know what is best and new people must be indoctrinated.

The reorganization of citizen involvement was fought
against by the board, especially the idea of twenty or thirty-
member citizen councils to advise the board. The board felt
these councils would take power from the board and the councils
are now fighting the board for a right to decide how funds
should be spent.\textsuperscript{3} Citizen Participation staff who work for
the board are not allowed to speak at board meetings even
though they are residents of the Model Neighborhood.\textsuperscript{4} This
attitude of citizen participants -- that being a salaried
employee of the C.D.A. or another agency breaks down one's

\textsuperscript{3}Information based on interviews with Tulio and
Lorraine.

\textsuperscript{4}Information based on interview with Lorraine W.
credibility may explain why participants prefer to work from a nonprofessional level after years of experience rather than get a job with Model Cities.

Of course, it is not the case that citizen participants do not receive any recompense for their time. In the case of the C.D.A. board the chairman gets one hundred dollars per week tax free, and the other board members receive tax free fifty dollars per board meeting. There are two board meetings per month and no money is deducted if local board members do not attend their committee meetings or meet other responsibilities of their membership on the board.

During the first years of Model Cities each board member received sixty dollars per month. This money was to be used for personal expenses related to being on the board, such as travelling expenses and babysitters. The increased amount is considered to be a salary and a means of assuring that board members show up for board meetings.

For welfare and social security recipients four hundred dollars or one hundred dollars a month tax free can be just as co-opting as the $5,000 to $8,000 per year taxed salary a resident employee of Model Cities might receive. The money is significant additional income and something which is not easily given up. Added to this are the rumors that so and so has a stash in this or that bank, or the fact that two employees took a tropical vacation with agency funds.\(^5\) Not

---

\(^5\) See Cambridge Observer, September 15, 1971, p. 1, and
only that, but 60% of all nonsecretarial resident staff at Model Cities consists of former board members or their spouses. These statistics do not include residents working for agencies funded by Model Cities.⁶

Model Cities' elections and voting for the referendum have always been conducted in a very casual manner. Shoe boxes or unlocked metal boxes have been used. Referendum ballots are collected door to door. The design team participated in the July 1972 referendum. Election of board members is carried out throughout the neighborhood without limiting residents of certain blocks to voting in specific locations. Lillian Denkewicz was told by a friend he went to three different polling places and voted for her at each place.⁷ Then there are the rumors of stuffing election and referendum ballot boxes. In 1970 elections board members from Area 4 got the following votes: John A. Collins, 316 votes; Janet Rose, 280; Helen Meehan, 228; Joan Costley, 214; Peggy Faull, 205; Mildred Hanright, 201.⁸ Despite the insignificant mandate from the people, many board members believe the board elections should occur less frequently than

Boston Chronicle, September 16, 1971, for an account of the Tenant Senate funds scandal.

⁶See Exhibit III for employment statistics.

⁷Information based on interview with Lorraine W.

⁸Cambridge Chronicle, June 18, 1970.
every two years.

The risk of a few citizens controlling a citizens' organization is that only a few may benefit from the organization. Involved residents benefit from the organization by being employed on the Model Cities staff. Janet Rose was the first person to move into rehabilitated subsidized leased housing. If residents are involved they are aware of the benefits available through Model Cities and how to take advantage of these benefits. A conflict of interest statute is supposed to discourage board members from taking undue advantage of financial benefits available from the program, such as construction contracts for board members. Activists feel the statute discriminates against them.

Also, there is the added danger of corruption of the few activists and of their losing contact with the people they represent. Bob Le Blanc, who is the city manager's representative on the board, believes the program has turned into a "pork-barrel" for certain board members. Other Model Cities and OEO organizations have similar problems.

---

9 Thesis by Michael Witwer Price, M.I.T., p. 34.


11 See: 1) Junius Williams, "The Impact of Citizen Participation," paper prepared for the National Academy of Public Administration, Washington, D.C., May 1970. A report on the Newark Model Cities Citizen Council control by a paranoid and co-opted majority where people not on the council are not allowed to participate in decisions or speak at
The activists at Cambridge Model Cities consist of CDA board members and nonboard members alike. The first activist group I will refer to as the "professional" residents. These people are "professional" in that their entire days are consumed by activities of neighborhood organizations. In fact, it is nearly impossible to arrange meetings involving these people because of the time conflicts with other meetings they must attend. It should be understood these are not meetings between resident representatives and concerned residents, but meetings of representatives only or representatives and professionals.

The "professional" residents in Model Cities have many common characteristics. "Professional" residents are unemployed or marginally employed. Janet Rose, Peggy Faull, Helen Meehan are all on welfare. They are on some form of public assistance and rent their housing. Janet R., Peggy F., Helen M., Rita C., Wally B., and Pat M. are all in this category. The women are largely divorced or separated. They have much time to devote to public service. They are involved in organizations such as settlement houses, tenant senates, civil rights groups, or the DED planning teams and related boards. They are people meetings without a report-back process to the community.

2) Bourgeois, Donald A., "Citizens' Role in Model Cities," Journal of Housing, 24 (December, 1967), 613-17. He describes how citizen committees are created by and owe existence and sole function to the CAP. The residents who are selected out and trained as leaders have less and less time to spend with their neighbors as a result of being elevated to prominence in their neighborhood.
with high self-esteem, self-confidence, and social ease. They enjoy their community involvement both as work and recreation. The activists have resided in the Model Neighborhoods for most or all of their lives. They are high school educated and have oral communication skills. They are completely absorbed in public life; in fact, this is their fulfillment. "Professional" citizens are anti-professional staff. They are suspicious of professional staff members and would like to see them eliminated from the program.

The second core group are the "elite" residents and they too have differentiation characteristics. They are employed, often self-employed. They own their own homes and have the "normal" family relations. They are from areas such as Tremont Street, which is called the suburbs of Model Cities. They are second-generation residents of the Model Neighborhood. Their involvement with Model Cities is occasional and they are usually interested in specific aspects of the program. Their public involvement before Model Cities is occasional and they are usually interested in specific aspects of the program. Their public involvement before Model Cities were in more conventional organizations such as church groups, girl scouts, PTA, or political parties. The "elite" resent the fact that there is a large representation
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12 Based on interview with Francis H.
of housing project tenants and welfare recipients in the Model Cities organization. In fact, the "elite" feel too much is being given to the poor and this help is destroying the family structure. Their main interest is with the deserving poor: children and old people. In housing they emphasize homeowners rehabilitation programs rather than housing for renters. The elite resident has tolerance and respect for professionals. They feel professionals have more expertise than residents and the program would not function without professionals. Eva StanKunas says she would like to see the Model Cities operation become more professional.

The Model Neighborhood contains many racial and ethnic groups. There has been no conflict over black and white representation. The only new activists are members of the new poor groups in the neighborhood; the Spanish and the Portuguese began demanding their share of the Model Cities funds and jobs, as well as running for board seats. The free Model Cities newspaper, The Cambridge Communicator, and the referendum ballots are now multilingual. Some representation of the Portuguese and Spanish groups had to be accepted by the Model Cities core group, because of the HUD guidelines.

---

13 Interviews with Jerry Spilewski, Eva StanKunas, and Lillian Denekewicz provided information for this paragraph.

14 Based on interviews with Jerry Spilewski and Eva StanKunas.
against discrimination. Funding would have been jeopardized if the Spanish and Portuguese had voiced discrimination.

Many of the activists have expressed an awareness of the lack of widespread community involvement in the Model Cities program. Some accept this situation as inevitable. Helen Meehans feels twenty or thirty involved people out of a neighborhood of 16,000 is good involvement. Peggy Faull says only two or three people come to meetings because residents feel someone else will take care of their interest. Lorraine Williams says board members should be community organizers.

In the interviews the activists agreed it is difficult to get other people involved. The activists believe other neighborhood people will react only in crisis situations which directly affect them. The activists cite very specific interests as causing their own involvement with Model Cities. Lillian Denkewicz was interested in home owner rehab; Francis Hayes wanted to improve the educational opportunities in the neighborhood. Peggy Faull wanted to see an improvement in the apparatus of the neighborhood, and a lowering of rents. Wally Brown wanted more business opportunities for the residents. In a poor neighborhood there are always crisis situations; people only need to be aware of the fact that the crises exist. Until poverty funds were dispersed to certain neighborhoods people in them did not know how poor they really were. Many residents in the Model Neighborhoods were shocked
to learn how their area had been chosen as a Model Neighborhood. They were not aware of their own plight.

During my interviews only Jerry Spelewski indicated neighborhood residents came to him to discuss their problems and to get information about Model Cities. He is part owner of a family grocery store in the neighborhood, which makes him visible and accessible. No one else had anything to say about personal contacts with their constituents. Peggy Faull did remark that just before being elected to the board she moved from Area 3 to Area 4 and she knew none of her new neighbors nor did they know her.

Most core people are very hostile to the reorganization enforced by HUD. It is impossible to determine how much of this hostility is the result of HUD interfering in the program or because the reorganization is a mechanism for greater citizen input. The reorganization calls for a formal mechanism to get resident response on their reaction to various Model Cities programs. "Surveys of users of specific services will be periodically conducted, and follow-up interviews of a sample group will be scheduled."¹⁵ Planning councils are being organized along the lines of New England town meetings. There are to be six planning councils in the following areas: 1. Housing; 2. Education; 3. Recreation;

¹⁵ *Third Year Action Program, 1971-72*, pp. 3-17.
4. Manpower; 5. Health and Social Services; and 6. Municipal and Environment Services. The planning councils will be composed of from twenty to thirty members with at least 51% of the membership from the Model Neighborhood. The councils will be responsible for analyzing problems, assessing needs, and program and project development. The planning councils will make policy suggestions to the planning committee. This committee will be comprised of ten board members elected by the board and the chairman of each of the six planning councils. The planning committee will review all monetary allocation to programs.

Then there is an evaluation and monitoring committee with ten members selected from the board. Finally there is the executive committee, composed of the CDA board officers and the chairman of the planning committee and the evaluation committee. "It receives all proposals, and recommendations coming from individuals, committees, agencies, etc., and refers such proposals to the appropriate level of the Board's structure for review and recommendations to the full board." The final reorganization feature is a Model Cities area-wide meeting to be sponsored by the board every three months.

One of the reasons HUD gave for the reorganization was, "the need for increased viable and widespread citizen

\[16\text{Third Year Action Program.}\]
participation and program planning and a need for continuous communication between the Model Neighborhood residents and their representative on the Board." HUD felt the CDA board needed a broader base, that they could no longer rely on sixteen people as citizen participation, nor a once-a-year referendum, but citizen participation on a continuing basis.

The board has been very disturbed by the reorganization which puts them in an advisory position to the Model Cities director and the Cambridge city manager. In the past they were decision makers. But, the real power in citizen participation is from the constituency. If the citizen representatives keep in contact with the residents so they are sure at all times that they really represent their wishes, this will protect the citizen representatives' position on most issues.

The following are three case histories of activists. I estimate the "professional" activists outnumber the "elite" activists 3 to 1.

Two "Professionals"

Helen Mehan, the present CDA board chairwoman, has lived in the neighborhood all her life. She has moved from

17 Cambridge Communicator No. 8, 1971.
Area 3 to Area 4. Her parents were first generation Lithuanian-Americans. Her parents were very poor, but never on welfare. Mrs. Meehan said she used to pick up welfare baskets for other children in the neighborhood who were ashamed to go and get them during the depression. She says she had always been very sympathetic to the underdog. She describes herself as very stubborn, a child who seldom cried and who was never afraid.

As a child she was turned off by the Catholic Church, especially the priest's role as an authority figure. She enrolled at Cambridge Latin High School when her parents thought she was going to St. Mary's. They let her stay at the public school. When she graduated from high school she was offered a scholarship to Radcliffe. Her parents would not let her go because they believed a woman's place was to have children and be a housewife.

Her community involvement began with the Margaret Fuller settlement house. She says she worked to get the suburban people off the boards and to put neighborhood residents on the board.

Mrs. Meehan is divorced and supports her seven children with welfare. They live in a rent supplemented apartment. She divorced her husband within the last few years. Mrs. Meehan says she should have divorced him long ago because he drank and was physically abusive.
Mrs. Meehan says her objective is utopia. She says residents are still begging, but when the "establishment" offers you something with one hand you have to know what they're doing with the other. She would like to see residents trained for professional jobs with equal pay, with responsibility and experience given the same weight as education.

Peggy Faull lets you know right away she has been with the Model Cities program from the beginning, and that her educational qualifications are 55 years of being poor. She is fifty-five, but looks older and is very frail. Her children are grown and she is not married.

She feels Model Cities has wasted a lot of money and that the city has not cooperated with the program. She says in efforts to improve the general appearance of the neighborhood, cleaning streets and planting trees. The city feels because the Model Neighborhood Area has money the neighborhood should pay for it. (The city operates on a budget of about $30 million dollars a year and the money coming into the MNA probably appears to be a windfall to the city accountant.)

She would like to see fewer professionals in the agency. She feels residents should have been trained and in all jobs by this stage in the program. She says she has never been intimidated by people with more money or education. She says once poor people get to the point where they think
and can express themselves the upper class becomes fearful. She says fear is the most destructive of all emotions.

Mrs. Faull's daughter got her involved in community affairs by asking her to attend a meeting on the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Mrs. Faull was always a politician, she was voted the person most likely to be a politician by her high school class.

She dislikes professionals telling people what they need; people know what they need. She describes professionals as do-gooders out to solve the problems of the world.

An "Elite"

Lillian DenKewicz is in the "elite" resident category. Her husband is a self-employed roofer. They own their own home, and her father, brother and sister live in the neighborhood. They have five children; the oldest is in college and the others go to Catholic schools.

Mrs. DenKewicz has been active in girl scouts and the PTA. She attended a secretarial college after high school and is licensed as a real estate agent, and as an insurance agent.

She was on the first board. She promoted the homeowner rehab project in the neighborhood and the training of residents as teacher's aides. Her sister is a teacher's aide. During the winter of 1972 she worked part time in the planning department at Model Cities. In June she resigned to take her children to her summer home in New Hampshire.
The Protest Group

A small group of Model Neighborhood residents feel the CDA program in Cambridge should be discontinued. They feel there is bad faith on the part of both the citizen participants and the federal funding agency. In this group are former CDA board members and staff members. They have left their positions in protest.

Joan Lukosunas resigned her seat on the board during the reorganization. She had been the board's vice chairman. She said she felt the agency had no power -- "the program was designed in Washington, guidelines were set up in Washington and the city manager has veto power on any of our decisions or actions. It didn't take me long to see that this program was going in the wrong direction; that is, it dealt with the symptoms and not the causes of our neighborhood problems."18

Joan Costley resigned from the board in protest, along with Joan Lukosunas. Joan Costley is now employed by the day care program of the Providence, R.I. Model Cities.

Sister Loretta was employed as a professional staff member of Model Cities. She resigned because she believes Model Cities is merely keeping vocal people busy for five

Billy Woods was a research assistant at Model Cities. He resigned because he felt the agency was not functioning to solve "little people's" problems. The protest group is composed of younger residents of the neighborhood. They believe the Model Cities program was instituted in an effort to distract poor people from the ideas of radical change, both in objectives and methods. The protest group believes examples of attitudinal changes on the part of residents in the neighborhood is illustrated in an emphasis on proper dress and demonstration methods. Board members dress up for board meetings, and are critical of the dress habits of the professional staff. Board members have criticized professional staff for giving job interviews while sitting on the floor. Personnel staff say this is not done. This attitude on the part of residents does illustrate the middle class values which are emphasized, while more important problems go waiting. Literally hours have been spent at board meetings discussing dress code.

During a crisis involving Model Cities and City Hall a majority vote of board members rejected the suggestion that they sit in at City Hall. The board members were worried this
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19 Based on interview with Sister Loretta.
20 Based on conversation with Billy Wood.
21 Conversation with Katherine Barkan.
22 Conversation with Francis O'Connell.
tactic would give them too radical an image. Instead, they called a news conference with newspaper and television reporters. They felt this to be the proper image of protest.\(^{23}\)

The primary reason given by the protest group for their disenchantment with Model Cities is the distraction caused by the program. They feel the program has tempted the neighborhood with a large amount of money, but that this money has not been used to solve the many problems existing in the neighborhood. Some feel the federal government never intended to have the money used to solve neighborhood problems, but that they buy the neighborhood off.

Hard Times, a program to organize tenants in the neighborhood and provide them with legal and tactical information is supported by Joan Lukosunas and Sister Loretta. Billy Wood is organizing a group called Poor White Americans. The objective of this group is to fight the systematic discrimination against poor whites.

The members of the protest group were in large part once members of the activist group. They threaten to encourage residents to boycott the next CDA election and referendum votes. They also threaten to organize residents to vote against continued funding of the Cambridge Model Cities Program.

\(^{23}\) Katherine Barkan.
VI. MODEL CITIES: CITIZEN PARTICIPATION GAME

Below is a game on citizen participation in Cambridge Model Cities. The purpose of this game is to simulate decision-making processes involving professionals and residents. The game is intended to show the difficulties of trying to be efficient and also involving residents; the problems arising from lack of communication; the residents' dilemma when forced to make a decision which cannot be in the best interest of diverse constituents; and the planners problems with trying to interrupt and impart information to the residents.
MODEL CITIES: CITIZEN PARTICIPATION GAME

Gerald Billes
Glenda Skiffer
History of Involvement and Purpose

We, Glenda Skiffer of the Planning Department and Gerald Billes of the Architecture Department, have been working with Cambridge Model Cities for nearly a year on a 703 grant for a community facility. The head of the planning department at Model Cities hired us to aid him in submitting this proposal. With the understanding that Model Cities has priority on this money, the design team of persons mentioned began at the beginning to coordinate all the necessary inputs necessary for such a proposal. Included in the study was a sense of the need of a community or neighborhood facility and where, if a facility is needed, should it be located. Inclusive in the framework of the participation process is the decision-making body on which this game is based. The decision-making group is made up of a diverse interest range from the planner himself to a resident active enough to donate time and effort in seeing positive decisions reached. Site selection, the goal of the participants, is one of many decisions which must be decided during the participation process and is abstracted somewhat out of context (because of its interconnection with other issues) but were necessary for manipulatory game purposes.

This exercise is for the purpose of allowing planning or architecture students or whomever to have the opportunity
of experiencing a specific participatory process as we interpret its existence at Cambridge Model Cities.

Administering the Game

The optimal number of people needed to play the game are 8, preferably planning students or someone who has experience understanding data in map and written form and deciphering it. There can be number of observers; however, the game was written to be played and the chances of enjoyment are greater if the person experiencing this game participates.

The administrator must begin with a willing group of people who in the introduction are told the history of the game and its application to this particular group (in our case planning or architecture students). Also included in the introduction phase are:

1. Purpose of the game (I).
2. Briefly what each person or group of people will be given as information about their role and maps explaining such things as the location of existing agencies who desire space in the facility.
3. Explanation of objectives (IV).
4. Say that there will be a negotiation period after which a vote will be taken.
5. Explain that each person is given a certain number of points. It takes 51 points to get a site selected. Since no one has 51 points you will all need cooperation from other participants. After a vote, there will be a reevaluation of power points with the community. Reevaluations will be subjective. This is the way we feel the community will react to your decision on a certain site.
6. Pass out name tags at random to the participants. These tags tell each person the role they are expected to play and should be pinned on.
7. Each person is then handed a specific set of material different from everyone else's as no one knows exactly that of another and should be aware of those inequities existent in a community which he or she is to use as a basis of knowledge to enable this person to act responsively to the task at hand.

8. Explain briefly the decision rules (VII).

9. Explain player interaction (VIII).

10. Explain constraints.

11. Explain that the planner is to sit to himself with his map, that the professionals are to be independent and having no map must receive this information from someone who does have a map, that residents A, B, and C are a group having access to their map, and residents D and E are also a group with use of a map of information. Hand these respective maps out.

12. Reiterate the use of power points of decision making and scoring.

13. Begin negotiation period as on Time Schedule (XI), and allow a 15-minute limit before a vote.

After a negotiation period collect all the votes. If by the time of the vote 51 points are not tallied on one site or a combination of sites reevaluate planner's points only (subtract 5 from his use) and begin another negotiation period as listed in time schedule (XI). If a decision is made on a site reevaluation will be taken as shown in players' point spread after voting on a site (X). If a combination of sites are selected (two is the limit), reevaluate points based on optimal site chosen for each individual.

Repeat this operation as indicated on time schedule (XI) until the "END".
A discussion should follow and an evaluation if possible by the administrator(s) should be written.

Thank people for playing game.

II. SETTING AND ISSUES

The game is set in a model cities area at the present time (1968 = present).

The issues are the viability and volatilability of a neighborhood as expressed in the community participation process. Equally important issues in the decision process are the impact of community participation in the planning process, protection and preservation of neighborhoods, and improving these neighborhoods.

III. GOALS OF THE GAME

1. To help planning students understand the process of community participation in making decisions in a Model Cities agency.

2. To enable planning students to understand the planner's role in reaching planning decisions in a Model Cities agency and his role in promoting community participation.

3. To help planning students understand the necessity of forming coalitions while reaching decisions related to the Model Cities area.

4. To provide a framework in which planning students can evaluate community participation.

5. To demonstrate that small power blocs can influence decision making and prevent large power blocs from determining decisions.

IV. OBJECTIVES, DECISION MAKING, AND SCORING

The objective of the game is for each participant to have a site chosen which most benefits his constituents. Responsiveness to people you represent will increase your degree of power. In order to reach this objective each participant should try to influence the votes of the other participants. As you gain power of decision making, someone else loses theirs.
After negotiations have been completed each participant will have an opportunity to vote using the points given him at the beginning of the game. A participant can divide his points and vote both positively for a site or negatively against a site. A participant can vote positively for only one site; negative votes can be cast against more than one site, in which case the individual's points double. Participants also have the option of abstaining from voting at all. It takes 51 points for a site to be chosen for the facility.

According to what decision is made, a new evaluation of your power in the neighborhood will be made by the administrators of the game. This evaluation determines your relative "win" or "lose" status. After a vote each person's power points will either be diminished or unchanged or increased based on the decision reached.

V. PLANNING AND INTEREST GROUPS

1. Professional Planner
2. Child Care Center Representative
3. Teen Representative
4. Resident A - representing Model Cities' Board, District I Planning Team, Health Clinic, Elderly, Ethnic Group I (Spanish)
5. Resident B - representing District I Planning Team, Model Cities Board, Health Clinic
6. Resident C - representing District I Planning Team, Ethnic Group I (Spanish), Tenants Organization
7. Resident D - representing Model Cities Board, District II Planning Team, Elderly, Ethnic Group II (Portuguese)
8. Resident E - representing District II Planning Team, Ethnic Group II (Portuguese)

MULTISERVICE FACILITY - One building housing a variety of service agencies and organizations used by members of the community. The facility provides the advantage of one-stop service to members of that community.
All agencies in the community have space needs; therefore, each is a potential occupant of the building.

Owners of possible facility buildings:
- The city is not trusted by the community, who feel they have little input in city operations.
- The Redevelopment Authority is a bureaucratic agency and has initiated projects which have not been completed in the form which was originally presented to the community. There is a problem of communication between people of the community and the Redevelopment Authority.

If the Redevelopment Authority or the city are involved in the proposed facility there will be more net funds from the federal government.
Planner

Child Care - provides a day care for pre-kindergarten children of both districts. Admission priority is given to AFDC children. Tuition is based on parents' ability to pay.

Elderly - interested in offering counseling, hot food, and recreation to old people, throughout the Model Cities area.

Ethnic Group I - the larger of two foreign-language-speaking minority organizations. Predominately located in District I.

Health Clinic - offers physical and psychological preventive medical care to all age groups in District I. The clinic is controlled by community residents.

Tenants Organization - composed of apartment dwellers in both districts, united to protect the rights of tenants and to influence legislation pertaining to landlord/tenant relations.

Professional Planner - the planner desires the community to have a viable physical environment. The planner is sensitive to the social and psychological impact of the physical development of the community, and supports the participation of citizens in making decisions. The planner's appointment is confirmed by the Model Cities Board.

Model Cities Board - the majority of board members are elected representatives from the community. District I and District II are represented equally on the board. Board members must approve all budgets, job appointments, and progress decisions dealing with Model Cities.

Teen Representative - provides academic and recreation programs for teenagers after school hours; counseling is also offered. Active in both districts.

Ethnic Group II - the smaller of two foreign-language-speaking minority organizations. Predominately located in District II.

District I Planning Team -
District II Planning Team -
the planning teams are the mechanism for community participation in the city CAP (Community Action Program). Planning teams are funded by OEO.

The planner has 48 decision points.
Resident A - representing Model Cities Board, District I Planning Team, Health Clinic, Elderly, Ethnic Group I (Spanish)

Model Cities Board - the majority of board members are elected representatives from the community. District I and District II are presented equally on the board. Board members must approve all budgets, job appointments, and program decisions dealing with model cities.

District I Planning Team - The planning team is the mechanism for community participation in the city CAP (Community Action Program). Planning teams are funded by OEO.

Health Clinic - offers physical and psychological preventive medical care to all age groups in District I. The clinic is controlled by community residents.

Elderly - interested in offering counseling, hot food, and recreation to old people, throughout the Model Cities area.

Ethnic Group I - the larger of two foreign-language-speaking minority organizations. Predominately located in District I.

16 decision points
Resident B - representing Model Cities Board, District I Planning Team, Health Clinic.

Model Cities Board - the majority of board members are elected representatives from the community. District I and District II are presented equally on the board. Board members must approve all budgets, job appointments, and program decisions dealing with model cities.

District I Planning Team - the planning team is the mechanism for community participation in the city CAP (Community Action Program). Planning teams are funded by OEO.

Health Clinic - offers physical and psychological preventive medical care to all age groups in District I. The clinic is controlled by community residents.

8 decision points
Resident C - representing District I Planning Team, Ethnic Group I (Spanish), Tenants Organization

District I Planning Team - the planning team is the mechanism for community participation in the city CAP (Community Action Program). Planning teams are funded by OEO.

Ethnic Group I - the larger of two foreign-language-speaking minority organizations. Predominately located in District I.

Tenants Organization - opposed of apartment dwellers in both districts, united to protect the rights of tenants and to influence legislation pertaining to landlord/tenant relations.

6 decision points
Resident D - representing Model Cities Board, District II Planning Team, Elderly, Ethnic Group II (Portuguese)

Model Cities Board - the majority of board members are elected representatives from the community. District I and District II are represented equally on the board. Board members must approve all budgets, job appointments, and program decisions dealing with model cities.

District II Planning Team - the planning team is the mechanism for community participation in the city CAP (Community Action Program). Planning teams are funded by OEC.

Elderly - interested in offering counseling, hot food, and recreation to old people.

Ethnic Group II (Portuguese) - the smaller of two foreign-language-speaking minority organizations. Predominately located in District II.

11 decision points
Resident E - representing District II Planning Team, Ethnic Group II (Portuguese)

District II Planning Team - the planning team is the mechanism for community participation in the city CAP (Community Action Program). Planning teams are funded by OEO.

Ethnic Group II (Portuguese) - the smaller of two foreign-language-speaking minority organizations. Predominately located in District II.

6 decision points.
Teen Representative

provides academic and recreation programs for teenagers after school hours; counselling is also offered. Active in both districts.

2 decision points
Child Care Center Representative provides day care for pre-kindergarten children of both districts. Admission priority is given to AFDC children. Tuition is based on parents' ability to pay.

3 decision points
VI. PLAYER RESOURCES

Players' knowledge of the rules and degree of power of each participant is the most important resource of the game.

Each person also gets a list of all other participants and who they represent, without their individual degree of power in decision making.

Each person also gets a list of all other participants and who they represent, without their individual degree of power in decision making.

In addition the planner receives a description of the other participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>DECISION MAKING DEGREE OF POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Professional Representative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident B</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident D</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident E</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HUD, the Redevelopment Authority and the city are not answerable to anyone, so do not derive their power from accomplishing such ventures. They will be represented by one of the game administrators.

According to the final decision, degrees of power will be subtracted or added based upon a breakdown of interests one represents. If a decision is beneficial to your overall interests, your degree of power increases. The reverse is true on the other hand if the decision made is not good for your constituency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREAKDOWN OF INTERESTS</th>
<th>DECISION MAKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Planner (social/physical)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Model Cities Board</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> District I Planning Team</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> District II Planning Team</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Health Clinic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Ethnic Group I (Spanish)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Ethnic Group II (Portuguese)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Child Care Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Teen Representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Tenant Representatives</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
- 3 sets of maps will be given, each having different information, each being given to different people (see Exhibit V)

- the planner is given one map to express location of sites to be chosen for a multiservice center, the owners of the sites, costs of the sites, costs of land and buildings, square footage of land and buildings occupying sites, amount of HUD grant for the facility, location of all existing agencies and facilities, location of ethnic groups, and location of low income areas (projects)

- Resident A, Resident B, and Resident C are given the second map to use collectively. Information to be included is: location of different sites from which a choice must be made, owners of sites, amount of HUD grant for the facility, location of all existing agencies and facilities, location of ethnic groups, and location of low income areas (projects)

- Resident D and Resident E use the third map together. Information includes location of different sites, amount of HUD grant, location of ethnic groups, and location of low income areas (projects)

- The remaining professionals must collaborate with either the planner or one of the resident groups to procure any pertinent information which may lead to an intelligent decision and vote at the end of the session.
VII. DECISION RULES

Participants decide on what actions to take (whether forming coalitions, gathering a dissenting voice, collecting more information, etc.) according to the projected approval of their constituency, the groups who are responsible for giving them the power they possess, and according to the information they are given or collect. Decisions are based on the following:

- Location sites
- Price of land and buildings
- Square footage of land and buildings-occupying sites
- Owners of sites and their history, if any
- Location of agencies to be placed in the facility
- Location of constituencies
- Coalitions that have formed
- Individual philosophies of the project's worth to community
- The necessity for as quick a decision as possible because of HUD deadlines

These decisions lead to a vote on the location of the multiservice center at the end of the negotiation period and an assessment of any change of standing or degree of power, if any, as a result of the voting. (The outcome, therefore, is based on meeting the demands of the most powerful opposition groups through concessions that will reduce the risk of opposition.

VIII. PLAYER INTERACTION

It is important for players to interact in order to further the cause of their interests in relation to the site chosen (if any are chosen). Since degrees of power are most necessary to make a decision (51 power points needed), and individual participants hold this power, the security of a decision rests on the coalitions formed by the end of a period of collaboration. It is also to the players' benefit to find out information not directly available to them.

It may be preferable to have no interaction. In such a case the participant must calculate the implications of this action.
IX. CONSTRAINTS

It is assumed that the decision has been made by HUD, in agreement with planners, to allocate $1,000,000 for a community facility to allow expansion of social welfare agencies in the community. Therefore such need has been established. There remains the decision on choice of sites, narrowed by the planners to three on which the participants must judge. Their judgement must be based on their given power to control decision.

Investigation of sites or seeking information not included in planner's study obviously delays decisions. The extent of deviation will be determined by the administrators of the game.

People involved must limit themselves to their information sources unless collaboration is established to exchange and add information (limited to 2 persons at a time). Added information must be written with pencil.

Only the planner can make announcements to the group as a whole.

HUD (the administrators) will intervene at any time it sees fit.

Participants' power does not change until the voting and decision, or lack of these, has terminated.

Players may not add or delete interest groups from their list of constituents.
X. PLAYERS' POINT SPREAD AFTER VOTING ON A SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Site Chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Rep.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Rep.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident B</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident C</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident E</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the first round of negotiation, if a decision is not made the planner's power points are decreased by 5 points. Five points are taken from the planner for each subsequent no-decision round. If no decision is made after 3 negotiating periods the planner has 49 - 14 = 33 points, indicative of his loss in power with the community.

XI. TIME SCHEDULE

30 min. Introduction and explanation of game. Participants may review information given them and ask questions.

15 min. Negotiation - $1,000,000 grant available.

5 min. Voting and reevaluation of points.

10 min. Renegotiation - $750,000 grant available.

5 min. Voting and reevaluation of points.

10 min. Renegotiation - $500,000 grant available.

5 min. Voting and reevaluation of points.

"END"

DISCUSSION
Evaluation of Game

It of course helps the game to be familiar with what is trying to be accomplished -- the selection of one of three possible sites. The criteria may vary from one project to another and may be immaterial but the important thing is to realize the process the eight participants must go through to make a responsible decision. It involves a negotiation and a consensus (vote) on where a decision stands. It should take at least 2 negotiations to realize, however, that time is of essence (when money from HUD is cut due to this lag in making prompt negotiations). Yet a conflict exists because time is invaluable to the understanding of a problem. One person asked why each person was given different information. It is impossible that all people know the exact same things because of each's interest, involvement, etc., with a political machine. This is the reason decisions are precious in Model Cities agencies that depend on community input.

Other questions were asked which may be puzzling participants. Which site did we think they should have voted for? This can be answered by looking at the Players' Point Spread After Voting on a Site (X) and choosing the site for that person based on the highest number that person would have received if the "best" site for him had been chosen. Why was the point spread so high
for the planner? His number of power points indicate his power to write the proposal and send it in with little rebuttal but he also was given in his role the obligation to fulfill a community based decision mechanism, which was why he was hired. Why not reevaluate participants by sites voted for but not on sites chosen? We thought this latter method of evaluation was best because people in the community only have power when influence is substantial enough to get something underway or retard progress, not on what you think as an individual or group.

We discovered in playing this game the acute conflicts, which naturally exist with normal play, that simple differences in rules make a great difference. Thus, midway into the second negotiation period the possibility of choosing not just one site, but a combination of two, was allowed; everyone voted for the dual sites 1 and 3. This is seen by the participants as a scapegoat and the game suddenly ends. It does not work quite so smoothly in the real world of Model Cities and if we played it over, we would eliminate this alternative. To see this mechanism as a problem solver or cooler was very interesting.

We asked questions on the understanding of the game. Insight on how different groups of players react to the same or similar stimuli is a beneficial consideration of the continued use of the game. There were few
misunderstandings because of the constant learning process built into play.

If people are frustrated at some time during play or at the end, an assuring indication of the game's working well can be reached.
VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Resident Leaders

Resident leaders were self-directed, having been neighborhood leaders for so long they no longer turned to the community for a mandate or direction. The "activists" had been neighborhood leaders long before OEO programs or Model Cities. They began their activities in settlement houses. The right to control was finally theirs in Model Cities. The activists became very involved in trying to prove they could successfully run a program.

They forgot to turn to the community to say, what do you want, or, is this what you want? They took the same position residents always criticize in professionals -- the activists assumed they knew what other residents needed.

Resident leaders did not organize the people. They assumed people who were not involved did not want to be involved. They did not attempt to reach new people, especially the young, who might have reached a stage by that point where they would have been receptive to involvement. Instead, the resident leaders, with years of experience participating, carried on in the direction they believed best. They did not have the opportunity to share their experience with new leaders nor the opportunity to learn new approaches and
objectives from potential leaders. In my opinion, a good leader is always preparing someone to replace him. Especially so, when they live with the instability with which grass roots leaders live.

The old leaders were hostile to a change in leadership. They feared the loss of their presumed power and influence. With what would they replace their satisfaction from participation?

Old leaders had no place to go. They were not forward-looking and saw no other means for their participation except in the enclaves of their community. None has shown the perception of Saundra Graham. Mrs. Graham moved from being a resident leader in the Riverside section of Cambridge to becoming an elected city councillor. In her new position Mrs. Graham represents the poor people of not only Riverside, but of the City of Cambridge.

Because these people are poor is no reason to assume that they are stupid. They have benefited from their political and planning experiences and are prepared for new arenas if only they would take or make themselves some options.

Redistribution of Resources

The Model Cities Program almost demanded a confrontation between residents and their cities. Especially in small cities like Cambridge, the supplemental funds from HUD were a very important addition to the city's resources.
They were not easily going to give up control of these monies or redistribute the power base.

Redistribution of assets may be considered one of the successes of the Cambridge program. Residents received a high proportion of the jobs in the agency and the accompanying salaries. Even board members received stipends. Being a resident participant is time-consuming and physically demanding and many of the board members were not in a financial position to volunteer their services. Resident leaders certainly looked out for their own, where money was involved.

**Model Cities Program**

Two aspects of the Model Cities program contributed to the failure of citizens to control the organization. 1) The funding was very slow in coming into the neighborhood, as it was throughout the country. During the waiting period there was a natural lull in participation, because there was no money to work with. Noninvolved residents were waiting to see something happen and were disappointed when nothing was happening. Regaining their confidence and producing programs was very difficult for leaders to do simultaneously. With the option of trying to put together programs beneficial to the neighborhood and mobilizing residents, leaders took the former option. I believe they could not have done both well. 2) The legislative guidelines for Model Cities clearly give control to
the local governing body, the City of Cambridge in this case. Residents did not expect to be challenged on the control issue three years after the program began. They felt they had legally safeguarded rights to control the program. The only way residents could have maintained control was to have had a completely mobilized community and a more-than-outstanding program already in existence.

Nonprofessional Job Opportunities

Model Cities was instituted as a demonstration program of limited duration. This means citizen participants, professionals, and staff must look toward ending their involvement in Model Cities. Citizen participants with long term involvement in Model Cities have the difficulty of finding a means of involving themselves in the community as thoroughly as they could with the mechanism of the Model Cities program. As Michael Price concluded during his research on Cambridge Model Cities, "participation itself educates: socially, politically, and administratively." In meetings and conversation with long term participants their knowledge of program, policies, and administrative procedures in housing, welfare, recreation, education, and city services is quite extensive; and they have gained this knowledge through participation in Model Cities and in special training programs. These people have the capabilities to work as professionals in public and private industry. Position in these areas should
be made available to them even though they have no academic credentials. Their experience in social service, as well as their experience with poverty gives them a unique expertise which should be utilized.

For participants on welfare it is especially senseless not to give the opportunity to earn their livings when they have so much to offer society. Civil Service should put emphasis on experience as a qualification.

Local citizens employed at Model Cities are usually in the $6,000 to $12,000 wage range. When Model Cities is no longer an employer these people will have a very rude awakening, because under the present system they will not be able to find jobs which pay such high wages. High school graduates whose main qualifications are experience and self-education are not employable in professional categories in the job categories and wage scales they have at Model Cities. Even given citizen employees at Model Cities are often overpaid, because other citizens set the wage scale. They will not be in the frame of mind to return to welfare, household servants' work, or factories. Positions of responsibility similar to the ones they now occupy and with opportunities for advancement must be available.

The job opportunities of which I speak should have been available throughout the years of the Model Cities program. Given the opportunity for employment some of the residents...
with long time involvement would have taken the opportunity to take jobs where they could continue to strive for the same changes which caused their involvement in Model Cities. If these people had another opportunity for meaningful involvement this would have freed space for new citizen participants.

The Community Fellows program at M.I.T. is an example of the type of programs local universities in the area could make available to citizen leaders. The program could work on the undergraduate level, just as well. A year away from their immediate neighborhood problems could provide for a broader perspective and an opportunity to communicate with equally competent community leaders from other neighborhoods and even other parts of the country. The leaders might be able to see themselves as others see them.

**Accountability**

The only mechanisms for citizen review of the Model Cities program has been a yearly referendum and an election every two years. After the planning year response steadily lessened. Model Cities board members are often asked where all the Model Cities money has been spent. If neighborhood residents do not know how the money has been spent they could not possibly have reviewed the allocation of funds.

Publicity is one means which should be used to reach
Model Neighborhood residents. The popular newspapers in Boston and Cambridge as well as radio stations should be used to inform residents of the programs being funded by Model Cities, as well as the amounts being spent in each program area. Yearly financial reports should also be sent to every address in the Model Neighborhood. The voting record of each board members should be published. Residents have a right to know how their representatives are voting and how Model Cities funds are being spent.

When residents know how the money is being allocated and who is responsible for the allocations, they will be in a position to react. Of course, the response will probably be negative, but at least there will be input. The crisis orientation of the responses will keep board members on their toes. Board members are in the habit of putting professionals on the hot seat, but they have not themselves been put on the hot seat because there has not been a mechanism for accountability between resident representatives and other residents.

The planning councils will serve to broaden the base of citizen representation. The fact that there are six councils of from twenty to thirty people indicates there are more residents than the activist group willing to participate in the program.

Board elections have been at large; with a differentiation between Neighborhood 4 and Neighborhood 3. Residents
have a sense of a particular individual representing them only in terms of interest groups, such as the Spanish, Portuguese, and blacks. Homeowners; those on welfare, people in the projects, the elderly on the whole are not aware of people on the board representing their interests. Carving out electoral districts would serve only to play up the differences in the neighborhood and to jeopardize the representation of racial and ethnic minorities.

An assumption is that citizen representatives feel very strongly about not being criticized by other poor people. If they are losing touch with the people they represent, formalized accountability might cause them to reestablish these relationships. Before board members make decisions they should know what their constituents want. The entire reasoning behind having resident control and review is that residents will go into neighborhood homes and talk to residents on the streets and in general have a closer pulse on the neighborhood than a professional from another neighborhood or from another socioeconomic group. Those residents selected out and trained as leaders should not, while being elevated to prominence in the neighborhood, spend less and less time with their neighbors. Board members should be organizers. They should be on the street with the people, so they know the people and the people know them.
Professionals

Professionals accept unique responsibilities when coming to work for an agency which is community oriented. Professionals must be willing and able to train community residents to take over work loads held by professionals and in some cases to replace professionals. Professionals should also orient resident employees to professional office procedures, so that when residents go to work for organizations which are not resident controlled they will be capable and efficient employees.

Professionals going into resident controlled organizations should be able to deal with a continuous crisis oriented approach. This requires patience from the professional and an ability to deal with frustrations.

In order to avoid some crises the professional must be willing to take initiative in anticipating problem areas and suggesting solutions before the crises arises. Often professionals are reluctant to take initiative and try to influence resident decisions. Gordon Brigham was guilty of this. The reason professionals are hired is they have certain abilities which residents do not have. When residents and professionals are not willing to work together with mutual respect they can accomplish little in a situation involving citizen participation.

Planning alternatives must be provided by the
professionals. Residents simply are not aware of the many alternatives available to them. Professionals and residents may not agree on the best alternative, but it is the responsibility of the professional to provide all the alternatives.

What About Citizen Participation?

The catastrophe in Cambridge shows it is not easy to champion citizen participation and that mistakes are costly. But then the great leaders and professionals must have made mistakes if people feel the need to demand citizen participation. The broad categories under which the values of citizen participation fall are still valid.

1. A means of mobilizing unutilized resources -- a source of productivity and labor not otherwise tapped.

2. A source of knowledge -- both corrective and creative -- a means of securing feedback regarding policy and programs; and also a source of new, inventive and innovative approaches.

3. An end in itself -- an affirmation of democracy and the elimination of alienation and withdrawal, of destructiveness, hostility, and lack of faith in relying on the people.\[\]

Only if people participate and have influence over the social system affecting their lives are they going to be willing to live with the decisions. When people feel the system has failed and they can no longer endure the system,

---

1Cahn and Passet expand on these themes, pp. 16-66, Citizen Participation, New York, 1971.
violence results. I believe the ashes are smouldering now, but the fire will again erupt. The list of interest groups who feel they are disenfranchised gets longer by the day. It now includes blacks, women, poor whites, Spanish-speaking people, old people, and probably a few I do not know about. Separately or in coalition these groups can make this country an uncomfortable place in which to live. We must continue to make the democratic process a reality in this country.
EXHIBIT I

The Neighborhood Family Care Center was the first agency contacted by the design team to discuss the neighborhood facility. NFCC agreed that agencies in the community had space needs, but were skeptical about meeting these needs with Neighborhood Facilities Grant funds. NFCC was wary of the City of Cambridge Mayor's Office having control over the facility if the City submitted the application. They did not want the neighborhood facility located near their offices, as this might result in competition for funds and clients between the two centers.

NFCC and the design team had meetings during the month of June, 1971. The following is a summary of discussions at these meetings:

Neighborhood Family Care Center, June 1971

NFCC Staff: Craig Lewis, Dr. Clark, Deidre Terry, Louise Lambert

The following fact emerged in the first meeting:
1. Total NFCC staff was 35 with nine full-time workers and 26 part-time workers, including volunteers.
2. Their facility provides social services.
3. Site: They thought either the Roosevelt Towers or Newtowne Court are the most probable locations.
4. Special limits were imposed on the program because of the fact that they were operating with 1500 square feet.
A total of 3000 square feet was needed to offer the range of services they could provide.

Minutes 6/23/71
Meeting with Neighborhood Family Care Center
The following suggestions were made during the discussion:
1. Two neighborhood facilities, one in Area 3 and one in Area 4, should be provided.
2. Specialized services should be offered in two areas with one main center.
3. One health center target area might be East Cambridge. Because of the proximity of Area 3 to the Cambridge Hospital, there is no need for neighborhood-based health services there.

Because the City of Cambridge would own the center if it made the application, negative attitudes toward the center were expressed. There was a fear that agencies in the center would be controlled both financially and activity-wise by the City of Cambridge. Guidelines for the agencies within the building were requested, and it was proposed that a contract with the city guaranteeing agency control was needed before NFCC would participate in the facility planning any more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Carroll</td>
<td>NFCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deidre Terry</td>
<td>NFCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Carroll</td>
<td>NFCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Lasker</td>
<td>Civil Liberties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Faull</td>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily McFarland</td>
<td>Model Cities/H&amp;SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Appleby</td>
<td>CDA Board, NFCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Team</td>
<td>Camb. Comm. Serv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model Cities Planning Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT II

Neighborhood Facilities Task Force Meeting VII
9/14/71
Newtowne Court Basement

The community facilities meeting got underway at 7:30 p.m. Those in attendance were:

Helen Marchant
Lorraine Williams
George Caspa
Bill Wood
Jackie Carroll
Mike Appleby
Members of the Design Team
Katherine Tepper
Pearl Axtman
Cornelius McLaughlin
Joan Messina
Joan Cole

The subject of how the neighborhood might participate in the operation of the center was introduced. The composition of a neighborhood board was discussed. The question of incorporating a board was raised. The discussion then turned to questions of use of the site, affected agencies and current Task Force participation.

Jackie Carroll: Talked about the lack of participation in Area 4 and expressed the wish to talk to interested and affected people.

Bill Wood: Described the Teen Center now present in the Blouin Building and asked where these people would go if
this truly is the site for the neighborhood facility. Was concerned that the facility would disrupt the teen center for at least 2 to 2½ years until built.

Mike Appleby: It would not be that long; simply the time it takes for construction, six to ten months. The teen center could be in operation up till the very moment of building.

Bill Wood: We were thinking of the teen center which is now a social center to move to another part of the Blouin Building, and make room for a recreation space but the least you can do is look for another space that the teens can occupy while construction does take place.

Mike Appleby: Yes. We will do that.

Jackie Carroll: There is a problem between the teens and the elderly.

Mike Appleby: There is a possibility that the elderly will not be placed in the center.

Jackie Carroll: Elderly need a place and space like everyone else. I'm tired of hearing talk about doing something for the elderly and then not doing anything at all. Give them a place to eat, three meals a day and day care there at any hour without conflicting with the teens for the same space.

Wayne Hill: More space is needed. We have an alternative of salvaging one major part of the existing building.
General Question: What will happen to that building? Do you know how cold it is in that building in the winter?

Wayne Hill: For $250,000 you can adequately weatherproof walls. That's not a problem. Studies are being made and the building seems usable.

Mike Appleby: Rehabilitation is just one alternative. An alternative is to look into rehabilitation of one part of the present building, and build partially new. The other alternative is to demolish the building and have new construction.

Bill Wood: Have you guys thought of raising the rent all around this development? Landlords would see the opportunity of making more money by having students, professional, etc., move into the neighborhood and the low income residents out. Where will they go? Such a center would improve the area and encourage a changeover.

General Question: What will the rent in the building cost?

Lorraine Williams: Head Start can't pay even $2.00/square foot for space. They are being given space wherever they are at present.

Jackie Carroll: Maybe Areas 3 and 4 should get together and combine their efforts.

Mike Appleby: Who do we want as a sponsor? This is a major question to be resolved. One possibility is Community Services.
(The whole group opposed this.)

Mike Appleby: Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee would be another possibility.

Jackie Carroll: Yes. We can have a say if they are the sponsor. Have you talked to planning teams from Areas 3 and 4?

Bill Wood: The Neighborhood Board could be organized around the planning teams.

Joan Cole: We are the planning team from Area 3.

Jackie Carroll: You have to contact the planning team from Area 4 and get some interest brewing.

Mike Appleby: We have been working all out efforts to contact people.

Jackie Carroll: Not Area 4 people.

Mike Appleby: Yes. We had mailing lists of 800 people but that was too many because so few were showing up and it was so time-consuming.

Glenda Skiller: I have sent letters to a lot of people in Area 4 and even talked to your husband personally.

Lorraine Williams: What's going to happen to the synagogue at 238 Columbia St.?

Mike Appleby: The CRA plans to tear it down when it becomes vacant.

Lorraine Williams: They are always tearing things down.

Mike Appleby: Well, we're accomplishing something.
We've got a sponsor proposed and the planning teams will get together to discuss a neighborhood board. Another thing to begin thinking about is open space recreation planning for Area 4.

Area 4 Planning Team
**EXHIBIT III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchboard Operator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Clerk Typist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Room Operator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;SS Director</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Project Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-H&amp;SS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Recreation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Housing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Administration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee-Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing Planning and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sys. Spec.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant II</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Comp. Planning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cit. Part-time Worker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cit. Part-time Worker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cit. Part-time Worker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"There are currently fifty-nine (59) persons employed on the CDA central staff. Of this total, forty-two are Model Neighborhood residents. Of the seventeen (17) non-MNRs, five (5) are Cambridge residents. A total of forty-eight (48) positions are full time, and the remaining eleven (11) are part-time positions. All eleven of these part-time positions are held by MNRs.

One hundred (100) persons are currently working in positions generated by Model Cities funds in delegate agencies. Sixty-one (61) of these employees are residents of the MNA; the remaining thirty-nine (39) are non-residents. Of the thirty-nine non-MNRs, nineteen are residents of Cambridge. Thus 80 of the employees in CDA programs are Cambridge residents."


2Information from yearly personnel report, 1971.
"There are currently forty-two (42) Model Neighborhood Residents employed on the CDA Central Staff, thirty-one (31) of whom are employed on a full-time basis. To date, thirteen (13) of these resident employees have received promotions and/or advances resulting in more sophisticated job responsibilities and wage increases. The promotions, advances, and wage changes are as follows:"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Position</th>
<th>Promoted/Advanced Position</th>
<th>Original Salary</th>
<th>Present Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component Coordinator/Manpower</td>
<td>Component Director/Health &amp; Social Services</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$ 11,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Assistant</td>
<td>Public Information Specialist</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Recruiter</td>
<td>Citizen Participation Worker</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,640 (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>Receptionian</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>6,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>Sr. Clerk/Steno; to Principal Clerk; to Administrative Secy</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>Sr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>6,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>Switchboard Operator</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>6,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant I</td>
<td>Research Assistant II</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>Citizen Participation Worker</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>8,000 (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Participation Worker</td>
<td>Citizen Participation Director</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>11,000 (fired, rehire at $8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Liaison</td>
<td>(transfer) Public Housing Spec.</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,500 (fired, prosecuted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Assistant</td>
<td>Housing Specialist</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Clerk/Steno</td>
<td>Department Secretary</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Ibid.
EXHIBIT 5

SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Land</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Bldg</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Original HUD Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pri. own</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>61 to 81,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>delapidated shell</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>redevelopment authority</td>
<td>61 to 81,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP KEY

1. Site No. 1
2. Site No. 2
3. Site No. 3
4. Turk St. Projects
5. Health Center
6. Turk St. Projects
7. Elderly Center
8. Elderly Housing
9. Child Care
10. Community Services
11. Community Action
12. Family Counseling
13. Legal Aid
14. Teen Center
15. Folsom Place Projects
16. Redevelopment Authority
17. Teen Center
DISTRICT SITE INFORMATION

Site No. 1

Privately owned, Redevelopment Authority Owner: willing to sell

Acquisition: -
Sq. Ft. Land: -
Condition: Excellent

ORIGINAL HUD COMMITMENT $1,000,000

MAP KEY
1. Site No. 1
2. Site No. 2
3. Site No. 3
4. Turk St. Projects
5. Health Clinic
6. Turk St. Project
7. Elderly Center
8. Elderly Housing
9. Child Care
10. Nodel Cities
11. Community Services
12. Community Action
13. Family Counseling
14. Legal Aid
15. Teen Center
16. Folso. Flats Projects
17. Redevelopment Authority
18. Teen Center

[Map of the district showing various sites and streets]
DISTRICT 1 COPY

SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No. 1</th>
<th>Site No. 2</th>
<th>Site No. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Owner:

Acquisition:

Sq. Ft. Land:

Eq. Ft. Bldg:

Condition: Excellent Delayed Shell Good

ORIGINAL BUDGET COMMITMENT $1,000,000

MAP KEY

1. Site No. 1
2. Site No. 2
3. Site No. 3
4. Turk St. Projects
5. Turk St. Projects
6. Turk St. Projects
7. Model Cities
8. Pulaski State Projects
9. Redevelopment Authority Ten-Cent

district 9

district 9
Model Neighborhood residents. The popular newspapers in Boston and Cambridge as well as radio stations should be used to inform residents of the programs being funded by Model Cities, as well as the amounts being spent in each program area. Yearly financial reports should also be sent to every address in the Model Neighborhood. The voting record of each board member should be published. Residents have a right to know how their representatives are voting and how Model Cities funds are being spent.
APPENDIX A

ACTIVISTS

Janet R. Drafting Committee, 2 CDA Boards, President Area 4 Planning Team

Helen M. Drafting Committee, 2 CDA Boards, Board President, Neighborhood House board member

Eva S. 2 CDA Boards, Finance Chairman 3 years

Peggy F. Drafting Committee, CDA Board, MC staff, husband former MC employee

Pat M. Drafting Committee, CDA Board, MC staff, husband on Tenant Senate and PSC Councillor

Rita C. Drafting Committee, CDA Board, MC staff, husband former MC employee

Francis H. Drafting Committee, CDA Board Chairman, MC staff

Jerry S. CDA Board Chairman, Democratic Committee

Lillian D. CDA Board, MC staff

Lorraine W. Settlement House Director, Tenant Senate, Drafting Committee, CDA Board, MC staff, Tenant Control Board, CEOC Board of Directors, Corp of Cambridge Black Fund Inc., COBI

Wally B. CDA Board Chairman, MC staff, Tenant Senate member and employee

Billy W. Drafting Committee, Planning Team, MC staff (mother on board)

Althea M. Drafting Committee, City Schools staff, Director Fletcher Teen Center

Barbara A. CLC staff

George G. CDA Board, Tenant Senate employee
Helen Y. CDA Board, MC staff
Gail S. Drafting Committee, Community Schools staff
Tulio E. MC staff; Spanish Council
Jackie C. MC staff, President NFCC, Public Housing Authority staff, Planning Team (spouse MC staff)
Aurelio T. COPA Director, Donnelly Field Planning Team
John C. CDA Board, Elderly Council, Tenant Senate
Curran Rector Local Catholic Church
Roberto S. President Spanish Council
David C. 2 CDA Boards, CEOC Board member

NFCC - Neighborhood Family Care Center
COBI - Conference of Organizations, Blocks, and Individuals
COPA - Committee of Portuguese Americans
CDA - City Demonstration Agency
MC - Model Cities (same as above)
PSC - Public Service Careers
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