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Abstract

Trauma Informed Community Building (TICB) is a new approach to community development that utilizes a “trauma” lens when engaging with communities that have been negatively impacted by concentrations of poverty and crime, social isolation and economic disinvestment. TICB first acknowledges the adverse effects persistent trauma has on individuals and communities and how these effects challenge “traditional” community building strategies. The practice involves a set of intentional strategies at every level of the social-ecological model—individual, interpersonal, community and system—to reduce the amount of chaos and stressors in individuals’ lives, to build social cohesion among neighbors and institutions and to foster community resiliency over time. By implementing these strategies, the authors hypothesize individuals will increase their ‘readiness for change,’ which, in turn, lays the foundation and support for effective program and service delivery and sustainable individual and community change. They argue these two outcomes are critical when working with “trauma-impacted” communities that are undergoing any kind of major transition and disruptions—i.e., housing redevelopment and/or relocation.

TICB was created by BRIDGE Housing Corporation (BRIDGE), a nonprofit affordable housing developer in the U.S. Pacific Northwest, based off of its six years of community building experience in San Francisco’s Potrero Hill neighborhood, as part of the master redevelopment of Potrero Terrace-Annex public housing under San Francisco’s HOPE SF initiative. In this thesis, I utilize the case study methodology and mixed-method techniques to explore what it means to approach community building with a “trauma” lens. I explore the evolution, implementation and early impacts of TICB at Potrero Terrace-Annex and I assess the value of TICB’s framework as a whole and key lessons learned and challenges. Specifically, I examine the extent to which BRIDGE’s community building activities have positively impacted the social dynamics of the economically- and socially-diverse North and South side Potrero Hill communities, increased public housing residents’ civic participation and capacity, and helped transform systems, namely democratic processes and public education. I conclude with recommendations to inform policy, practice and future research.

Thesis advisor: Lawrence J. Vale, Ford Professor of Urban Design and Planning
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Trauma Informed Community Building (TICB) is a new approach to community development that utilizes a “trauma” lens when engaging with communities that have been negatively impacted by high levels of poverty, crime, social isolation and economic disinvestment. TICB first acknowledges the adverse effects persistent trauma has on individuals and communities and how these effects challenge “traditional” community building strategies. The practice involves a set of intentional strategies at every level of the social-ecological model—individual, interpersonal, community and system—to reduce the amount of chaos and stressors in individuals’ lives, to build social cohesion among neighbors and institutions and to foster community resiliency over time. The authors hypothesize that implementing these strategies will increase individuals’ ‘readiness for change,’ which, in turn, lay the foundation and support for effective program and service delivery and sustainable individual and community change—two outcomes, which they argue are critical when working with “trauma-impacted” communities that are undergoing any kind of major transition and disruptions—i.e., housing redevelopment and/or relocation.

TICB was created by BRIDGE Housing Corporation (BRIDGE), a nonprofit affordable housing developer in the U.S. Pacific Northwest, based off of its six years of community building experience at Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex—going forward will be referred to as Potrero Terrace-Annex—public housing in San Francisco’s upper-middle class neighborhood known as Potrero Hill. BRIDGE’s work at Potrero Terrace-Annex—branded as Rebuild Potrero—is one of four master redevelopment projects that is part of the City of San Francisco’s HOPE SF initiative, a public-private partnership to rebuild some of the city’s most distressed public housing, led by the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)\(^1\) and the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA). Among HOPE SF’s eight “resident-centered design principles” includes an explicit goal to build “a strong sense of community” (HOPE SF website). And, as a means of operationalizing that principle, HOPE SF has a strategy for

\(^1\) Formerly Mayor’s Office of Housing (MOH) when HOPE SF was launched in 2008
community building and a requirement for a designated Community Builder at each of the sites. This thesis is an assessment of BRIDGE’s approach to HOPE SF’s community building work, which was recently published in partnership with San Francisco State University’s (SFSU) Health Equity Institute (HEI) in a white paper “Trauma Informed Community Building: A Model for Strengthening Community in Trauma Affected Neighborhoods” (Weinstein et al. 2014).

BRIDGE’s implementation of TICB at Potrero Terrace-Annex provides important insights about the development of a community building initiative and the challenges Community Builders and others engaged with this work—i.e., developers, policymakers, funders and consultants—encounter politically, administratively and among the community in which it works. It also offers a promising example of how San Francisco—and communities more broadly—can assist with fostering authentic community relationships and community resiliency and achieving greater equity and social sustainability in community processes and projects in the future. The implications of TICB are especially important and relevant as two major federal initiatives to rebuild public housing through the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI) and the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) are underway and as the development of mixed-income communities expands more broadly.

1.1 Purpose and research questions

The purpose of this thesis is threefold. The first is to examine what it means to approach community building with a “trauma” lens, including how one thinks about three levels of trauma communities face—past, present and future trauma. The second is to explore the evolution, implementation and early impacts of TICB at Potrero Terrace-Annex; the third is to assess the value of TICB’s framework, including what strategies are working (or not working), the challenges with administering and measuring the effectiveness of this work and recommendations for the field. As a means of assessing TICB’s framework, I drill down on a specific set of impacts, which are laid out in the three research questions below:

1. To what extent has BRIDGE’s community building activities positively impacted the social dynamics of the economically- and socially-diverse North and South side communities of the Potrero Hill neighborhood?
2. To what extent has BRIDGE’s community building activities increased public housing residents’ civic participation and capacity?

3. To what extent has BRIDGE’s community building activities helped transform systems that govern and serve the Potrero Hill neighborhood, namely democratic processes and public education?

I also discuss spillover effects resulting from BRIDGE’s community building activities and embed discoveries about the dynamics and conditioning factors that promote or inhibit community building—i.e., spatial implications, logistics and incentive structures.

1.2 Methodology

I utilize the case study methodology and mixed-method techniques to explore these questions. I first began by reviewing the trauma and community building literature; then I reviewed the history and context of Potrero Terrace-Annex, drawing largely from BRIDGE administrative files, relevant planning and program evaluation reports, HOPE SF’s 2012 baseline study, news articles, documentaries, doctoral dissertations and master’s theses. I obtained from BRIDGE staff administrative data containing participation data of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents and surrounding community stakeholders for all of the community building activities. I cleaned and processed the various datasets to derive at my analyses around participation patterns.

To supplement this secondary analysis, in early 2015, I conducted two visits to the Potrero Hill neighborhood—one in January and another in March, each with four to five days in the field. My March visit was supported with funding from a competitively awarded Emerson Travel Grant from Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s (MIT) Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP). While on site, I conducted participant observations at two TICB activities—a cooking workshop and the walking club. I also conducted 20 semi-structured key informant interviews—in-person and by telephone for approximately 45 to 90 minutes each—with a range of community stakeholders, who have been involved with TICB in some capacity, whether as HOPE SF or BRIDGE implementers, planning consultants,
researchers and consumers, including those from both the North and South sides. I identified people to interview through a combination of web research of organizations and agencies involved with HOPE SF, recommendations from BRIDGE staff and the snowballing of interviewee recommendations.

1.3 Limitations

There are obvious significant limitations to this research—being a single site, non-representative interview sample and single point-in-time dataset. Since TICB has only been implemented in Potrero Terrace-Annex, it is not yet clear how the model would be articulated or the outcomes it would yield in a different context—i.e., in a different geography, under a different political context and Community Building staff, with a different set of resources and financial opportunities and among a different demographic population.

Second, while I initially intended to lead a series of focus groups with Potrero Terrace-Annex residents, I was unable to do so because of concerns expressed by Community Building staff, who shared how residents have recently engaged with numerous studies and did not want them to feel “over-studied” or become fatigued. Additionally, considering an Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) sponsored study of Potrero’s community building initiative was simultaneously underway with this research, we collectively (Community Builder staff and researchers) felt it would be best if I did not interview the same residents engaged with that work. Relatively, another noteworthy mention is most of my findings represent a biased set of perspectives—in that many of the stakeholders I interviewed have vested interests in this work—as either administrators of the TICB program or as neighbors or residents who describe themselves and their involvement in TICB as part of their religious “callings” or civic duties. Collectively, they are likely to claim more positive results. Many other critical perspectives are currently not represented in this thesis, those including: staff at the varying service providers, businesses and

2 Some of these studies include BAYCAT documentary videos “Potrero Hill: A Timeline” and “Potrero Hill Archives Project” and SFSU’s HEI research on peer leadership, mental health assessments and youth assessments.
3 HEI, a research institute of SFSU, is directing the evaluation, which is due for completion the summer of 2015. HEI’s study is an evaluation of Potrero Terrace-Annex’s TICB program. In addition to quantitative analyses of BRIDGE administrative data, its evaluation includes interviews with public housing residents and community stakeholders.
4 I did not learn of the AECF evaluation until after I submitted my thesis proposal and was underway with my first field visit and interviews.
educational institutions in Potrero Hill, stakeholders who are not currently engaged with community building activities and residents of Potrero Terrace-Annex. Additional research that captures these voices would add significant value to this present research.

Third, there are significant limitations to the empirical data I present. One challenge is the data are inconsistently reported in terms of their timeframe, reporting frequency and level of reporting. A second challenge is the data are not captured longitudinally and do not include all possible residents and stakeholders in the North and South sides. Therefore I am unable to assess participation trends over time—i.e., if participation has increased, decreased or sustained—and I cannot discuss participation trends by resident characteristics of participants and non-participants—i.e., who is participating and in what activities and how frequently, and who is not participating. Because of these limitations, I am unable to conclude if my present findings are representative of participation trends over the life of TICB.

As a result, the findings in this thesis should be interpreted as exploratory of one site, of a certain set of perspectives and of a snapshot in time; it should not be generalized to the broader Potrero Hill community. To address these limitations, I offer suggestions for an objective and generalizable research agenda in the conclusions section of this thesis.

1.4 Structure of this thesis

This thesis begins by contextualizing community building as an integral strategy to poverty alleviation strategies and particularly with public housing redevelopment (Chapter 2). The following chapters introduce the TICB model (Chapter 3); describe the implementation of TICB at Potrero Terrace-Annex (Chapter 4) and present outcomes and impacts of community building activities, highlight several exemplary activities and assess TICB against two frameworks (Chapter 5). Chapter 6 concludes with an assessment of Potrero Terrace-Annex’s TICB program as a whole and key lessons learned, challenges and recommendations to inform policy and practice and future research at Potrero Hill and beyond.
Evolution of community building

This section provides a brief overview of the community building literature. In particular, I examine the history of its evolution in the urban planning field, critical industries and entities that helped develop and implement this work, the various definitions and rationale for this work, strategies being employed, and research discussing its impacts.

2.1 Burgeoning of “community building”

During the middle of the 20th century, “community building” emerged as a new approach for addressing poverty, equality, community development and neighborhood revitalization. It was based on the premise that residents of poor communities should be engaged in solving their own problems (Saegert 2005; Kubisch et al. 2013). Some of its earliest appearances arose in the 1960s, initiated by the public sector through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Model Cities program, followed by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which involved community organizing efforts and social support services (Naparstek et al. 1997). It continued to proliferate in the late 1980s with the involvement of philanthropy and its launch of comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs), which sought to reshape the physical conditions of distressed neighborhoods, improve the social circumstances of disadvantaged communities and initiate the mobilization of community-level action. CCIs prescribed specific “community building” activities, including the encouragement of resident participation, the promotion of collaboration among community-based organizations (CBOs), and the fostering of social interactions and networks of support among community members (Kubisch et al. 1997; Kubisch et al. 2002; Kingsley et al. 1997; Chaskin et al. 2001; Briggs 2002).

Meanwhile several other public sector efforts were established in the 1990s, with the federal Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS), Family Investment Center programs, the Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community...
programs and the Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) program, which continued to encourage supporting community cohesion and active community participation among housing and community development strategies (Naparstek et al. 1997; Chaskin & Joseph 2010). Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) like IFF, Low Income Investment Fund (LIIF), Hope Enterprise Corporation and The Reinvestment Fund (TRF) also joined these efforts, making investments to support community building work and providing technical assistance to civic leaders (Berube 2012). Still, through the 21st century, community building continues to be embedded in the planning and implementation work around the federal Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI) and mixed-income housing and community development broadly.

2.2 National Community Building Network

The field of community building gained widespread attention with the formation of the National Community Building Network (NCBN) in 1993. Initiated by the Ford, Annie E. Casey, and Rockefeller Foundations and other urban initiatives, NCBN was a consortium—when at its peak had more than 800 members from 200 organizations across the U.S. and Puerto Rico (PR) and represented a diverse set of stakeholders from philanthropy, grassroots organization, policy experts, religious organizations, among others (Fiester 2007). It developed a set of principles for community building, which included:

- Integrate community development and human service strategies
- Start from local conditions
- Require racial equity
- Support families and children
- Value cultural strengths
- Build on community strengths
- Foster broad community participation
- Forge partnerships through collaboration

For 12 years, NCBN served as a national clearinghouse of information, networks, and resources for community builders to draw upon. It also administered trainings and conferences throughout its duration. NCBN was however dissolved in 2005 as the landscape for community building began to change: “The need for action had shifted from building awareness at the national level to supporting the work regionally and locally. Funders had shifted their attention from networking and relationship
building to ensuring the efficacy of work on the ground” (Fiester 2007, 2). It became evident that a national organization like NCBN was no longer needed or the best means for serving community builders at that time.

2.3 Evolution of community building and relationship to public housing

As federal public housing began to take a downturn, community building began to grow in its need to support redevelopment initiatives.

2.3.1 Brief history of U.S. public housing

U.S. public housing was first introduced under the Housing Act of 1937, which stated the federal government’s charge “to alleviate present and recurring unemployment and to remedy the unsafe and insanitary housing conditions and the acute shortage of decent, safe and sanitary dwellings for families of low income” (United States 1937). A housing program initially created to temporarily house working class families and those out of work during the Great Depression later became permanent housing for the “poorest of the poor” (Stoloff 2004). In many major cities across the country, public housing turned into “housing of last resort” and “concentrations of poverty,” primarily occupied by ethnic minorities (Vale 2000; Von Hoffman 1995).

Over time, the physical buildings in public housing communities began to deteriorate. Through a combination of rising maintenance costs, high inflation, poor management and the decline of tenant incomes, which were expected to cover operational and maintenance costs, the need for capital improvements outstripped housing authorities’ financial capacities (Stoloff 2004). To add to the physical crumbling of buildings, broken windows and elevators, public housing faced serious health problems from cockroach infestations to mold to inadequate heating and plumbing systems. High levels of crime and drug dealing also haunted communities, not to mention social stigmas and physical isolation. The

5 See Fiester (2007) for the history, evolution, successes and challenges of NCBN over the course of its lifespan, which includes interviews with the founders, leaders, members, critical friends and informed observers.
image of public housing became synonymous with “the projects,” distressed inner-city neighborhoods, minority poor and ghetto culture (Briggs et al. 2010). To many, public housing was widely viewed as a failure.

By the 1970s and 1980s, a growing literature of what housing scholar Lawrence J. Vale calls the “decline and fall” period of public housing began to surface (MIT lecture 2013). Some notable pieces include Lee Rainwater’s book Behind Ghetto Walls, which described the harsh physical and social living conditions of families living in St. Louis’ Pruitt-Igoe housing projects, and Alex Kotlowitz’s book There are No Children Here, which described the challenges two young boys experienced living in a Chicago public housing development. These and other pieces documented the severity and distressing circumstances that many public housing communities experienced.

To respond to these issues, Congress created the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (Commission) to study how the federal government could initiate a national agenda that improves the living conditions of public housing residents. Based off of the Commission's findings and recommendations, the federal government identified 86,000 “severely-distressed” public housing units and developed a set of policy responses. One such response, first passed by Congress as the Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD) in 1992, evolved and became commonly known as Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere, or HOPE VI.

Administered by HUD from 1993 to 2010, HOPE VI provided competitive grants to PHAs for the planning, demolition and/or revitalization of their most severely distressed public housing. PHAs applied for up to $50 million to support physical revitalization, management improvements and supportive services to promote resident self-sufficiency. HOPE VI provided PHAs tremendous flexibility, in that local housing authorities had latitude in how they designed and implemented their transformation initiatives (Popkin et al. 2004). Reflecting the Commission’s focus on community building and resident empowerment, the law mandated PHAs set aside 20 percent of the initial $300 million appropriation for community service programs and for supportive services programs, including literacy training, job training and youth activities.
Between the late-1990s and early-2000s, a small body of literature began to surface connecting community building and public housing. A seminal piece by Arthur J. Naparstek, Dennis Dooley and Robin Smith (1997), *Community Building in Public Housing: Ties that Bind People and Their Communities*, documented some of the early strategies being employed at public housing developments across the country and described how these activities helped residents move towards socioeconomic independence and improve the social environments of public housing more generally.

According to Naparstek et al (1997), the community building approach grew out of new understandings of the dynamics of urban poverty and personal barriers to independence. The work of William Julius Wilson and other urban researchers suggested that the roots of chronic poverty lie in the deteriorated social structure—a weakening of grassroots network of churches, schools, businesses, neighborhood centers, and families themselves—which nourished and supported the life of a community. In addition to arguments about new insights into the nature and dynamics of poverty, they argue that community building began to rise in the 1990s in response to other trends: the transformation of the physical, social and fiscal environment of public housing like HOPE VI; welfare reform and the devolution of responsibility away from federal government, and shifting views about poor people and their values. With the diminishing of traditional federal resources for social services and community development, PHAs began “re-examining a previously little-used resource: the energy and efforts of residents of public housing themselves” (Naparstek et al. 1997, 20).

The idea was that, community building could focus on “building social and human capital” among residents and “rebuild[ing] social structures and relationships that may have been weakened by decades of outmigration, disinvestment, and isolation” (Naparstek et al 1997). This perspective put the focus on the “people” versus the “place” and on the community’s “assets” as compared to its “problems.” Community building also encouraged residents to take on leadership and responsibility rather than be “passive recipients of services” (Naparstek et al. 1997). PHAs discovered that strengthening the public housing community could build a supportive social environment that can fulfill important community needs and help individual residents move toward independence.
As an implementation strategy, community building called for collaborative efforts among residents, housing authorities and partnerships with schools, nonprofit agencies, charitable foundations, local governments and other institutions to reconnect historically isolated public housing communities with the resources available in the city (Naparstek et al. 1997). Early examples of successful community building efforts included Boston’s Bromley Health development, which improved access to social services like health care and education and Pittsburgh’s Hill District, which increased resident participation in community planning.

2.4 The Aspen Institute Roundtable for Community Change

In the early 2000s, researchers at the Aspen Institute launched a project focused on community building. With support from the AECF, the Aspen Institute’s Roundtable for Community Change (Roundtable) embarked on the Contribution of Community Building Project. Among many things, Roundtable researchers commissioned three papers that highlighted the contributions of community building to programmatic outcomes and cross-cutting lessons in the field (Saegert 2005; Vidal n.d.; Kieffer & Reischmann 2004). They felt, “despite the 20 or more years of community building activity, the case for why and when it is important to invest in community building had not been well articulated or well substantiated” (Auspos 2005, 1). Eight months of research and three papers later, they developed a critical body of community building literature that Auspos summarizes in her 2005 white paper. The literature further builds out definitions for community building, its importance to the field and recommendations for when how and under what circumstances to invest in community building.

Since this project, the Roundtable continues to produce literature that is accessible to a broad audience of academics, policymakers and practitioners alike—including tools for measuring community building impacts (Kubisch et al. 2002; Auspos & Kubisch 2004; Auspos 2012a; Auspos 2012b), instructions on utilizing theory of change models to mobilize work (Anderson 2004; Anderson 2005), and strategies regarding practice (Kubisch et al. 2013).

Thus far, I have discussed the evolution and dissemination of community building work; yet, I have not discussed what is often meant by the use of the term. In this next section, I survey the various definitions
and applications of community building. I conclude with a brief discussion about how some researchers have tried to assess the impact of community building strategies.

2.5 Defining community building

Since its introduction to the field, the deployment of the term community building has been varied and complex, lacking a unifying definition for those who use it. Additionally, no one discipline claims the term: it has established a resonance in the fields of urban planning, sociology and public health. As a result, it is important to survey what researchers and professionals mean when they apply the term “community building.”

One of the earliest—and probably most widespread—definitions of community building was posited by Naparstek et al (1997), which described it as “the active participation of residents in the process of strengthening community networks, programs and institutions”. Echoing these sentiments was a definition coined by Walsh (1997) as, “efforts that catalyze personal relationships and social networks to improve community life” (291). Walsh’s definition also assumes that associations within a geographic area are important for community well-being; that bringing together a broad spectrum of stakeholders will provide a better understanding of problems; that sustainable solutions are based on knowing the facts, building on assets and having a shared vision improvement; and that an independent community-based capacity for analysis, planning and convening is essential for success (1997).

Around the same time, researchers Kingsley et al (1997) and McNeely (1999) began to build it out further, offering a more detailed definition of “…neighbors learning to rely on each other, working together on concrete tasks that take advantage of new self-awareness of their collective and individual assets and, in the process, creating human, family and social capital that provides a new base for a more promising future and reconnection to America’s mainstream” (3 and 742). In 1999, Chaskin added to the ideas about strengthening communities, including that residents are engaged with “identify[ing] priorities and opportunities and to work to foster and sustain positive neighborhood change” (1).

When the Roundtable embarked on its three-paper project, one of its explicit aims was to better understand the meaning of the term. At the outset of their research, they utilized Chaskin et al’s
definition for community building: "efforts to enhance the capacities of individuals and organizations in communities and the connections between them". They also developed a matrix, presented below in figure 2.1, as an attempt to categorize key dimensions of community building.

![Figure 2.1 Aspen Institute's community building strategies matrix](source: Auspos 2005)

While the definition and matrix held true against the research completed by Vidal, Saegert, and Kieffer & Reischmann, they also refined the definitions based off of the work they were seeing. Vidal extended the practice to also include "democratic or participatory efforts to enhance the capacities of individuals and organizations in communities and the connections between them" (Auspos 2005, 4). Saegert and Kieffer & Reischmann added "efforts to engage and represent the community as a whole as a third layer of activity, in addition to efforts to connect individuals and organizations" (emphasis added) (Auspos 2005, 4).°

More recently, Joseph and Gress (2013) defined community building as "...intentional efforts to promote connections among residents and a collective sense of responsibility for the development, including community and social activities and events, activities to promote effective neighboring, leadership development, conflict resolution and relationship brokering" (2). And, finally, while The Aspen Institute's 2013 report does not lay out a definition, it notes that "A core principle

° Saegert added community visioning/community-based planning as strategies to build capacity. Kieffer and Reischmann added relationship building and resource development as ways that communities make connections.
of a community-building approach to neighborhood change is that residents should be engaged in the work of improving their own communities: their knowledge of the neighborhood should undergird the work; their opinions and judgment should inform decisions; and their energy and commitment should be harnessed” (3).

While none of the definitions are identical, they all revolve around similar themes—that community building is about intentionally engaging residents in neighborhood change processes, building social cohesion and social capital among residents, and strengthening community capacity at the individual, community and institutional level to improve community life.

2.6 The rationale and expected outcomes of community building

2.6.1 Rationale

Auspos and Kubisch (2004) discuss the rationale for community building as threefold:

- Involving community residents in planning, designing and implementing change efforts in domains like housing, employment, crime and safety, education and health will increase the effectiveness of programmatic intervention and lead to better programmatic outcomes or improved community conditions;
- Community building creates resources and assets within the community that will better enable the community to take advantage of opportunities, resist downturns and solve problems in the future; and
- Community capacity building produces civic or political outcomes that are good in themselves and provide access to power bases that can benefit a particular neighborhood for its residents.

The literature also supports community building as a critical “precursor” for effective and sustainable community change (Hyman 2002; Auspos 2005).
2.6.2 Expected outcomes

Additionally, the field has not been clear about community building’s intended goals; therefore, one must ask: Community building to what end? Based on my research, there appear to be two primary goals community building seeks to achieve, or can be indicators to measure its success: (1) social cohesion and social capital and (2) civic engagement and capacity. For example, in Auspos’ 2005 white paper, she writes, how community building “builds trust and networks, mobilizes the community for action, gives legitimacy to plans, and lays the groundwork for future change” (4).

Social cohesion and capital can take the form of residents building relationships and sharing resources with one another (i.e., about job openings, babysitting referrals) to residents initiating regular interactions (i.e., play groups for their children). Increased community capacity can take the form of residents working together on common problems; managing, operating and implementing programs and services; assisting with components of multi-faceted projects and engaging with multi-organizational partnership and affecting outside actors and winning changes in policy or practice that benefits the community and its benefits (Auspos 2005, 5).

2.7 Strategies for building community

The research around this work describes two kinds of strategies for fostering community relationships through physical design and through social activities.

---

7 Social cohesion is the willingness of members of a society to cooperate with each other in order to survive and prosper. Willingness to cooperate means they freely choose to form partnerships and have a reasonable chance of realizing goals, because others are willing to cooperate and share the fruits of their endeavors equitably. (Stanley 2003, 5)

8 Social capital refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them (Putnam 2000, 19).

9 Civic engagement refers to the encouragement of the general public to become involved in the political process and the issues that affect them. It is the community coming together to be a collective source of change, political and non-political (American Psychological Association website).

10 Civic capacity, which is the interaction of human, organizational and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the well-being of a given community. It may operate through informal social processes and/or organized efforts by individuals, organizations, and the networks of associations among them and between them and the broader systems of which the community is part” (Chaskin 1999).
2.7.1 Physical design

Some community development efforts (HOPE VI among them) draw on New Urbanist design principles and assumptions as a strategy for building community. In the *Principles for Inner City Neighborhood Design*, the Congress for New Urbanism and the HUD outlined 14 principles to guide the redevelopment of HOPE VI sites to attain the architectural and social goals of New Urbanism. Of these include the goal of diversity, which includes constructing a diverse mix of housing with a broad range of housing types, price levels and varying income groups targets with hopes of attracting people of diverse ages, races and incomes into daily interaction. Another is creating diverse land uses, buildings and unit sizes. Probably most importantly is creating public spaces for congregation—i.e., public plazas, playgrounds, community centers/rooms to wider sidewalks with public furniture—and private spaces for resident interaction—i.e., low fences, front and back porches, common mailbox banks)—which can enhance and promote social interaction; positive interpersonal networks and community cohesion (Bohl 2000; Day 2003; Jacobs 1961; Katz 1994; Leccese & McCormick 1999; Talen 2002).

According to Talen (2002), she argues there is an implicit notion that “somehow the physical environment can influence social relationships” (Kleit 2005). From her perspective, New Urbanism, while quite explicit about advancing social equity and the common good, is not explicit about intending to advance “community” such as social interactions, social networks, and emotional support among neighbors (Talen 2002).

2.7.2 Social activities

Other strategies for building community revolve around social activities. These strategies comprise of developing human capital programs (i.e., education and workforce training), social activities (i.e., block parties, cultural and religious events), resident groups (i.e., seniors groups, parents groups) and regular tenant meetings (i.e., renters or homeowners meetings, resident-elected Local Advisory Councils (LAC)). Under the CCI era, staff emphasized strategies that improved resident leadership, capacity building; community organizing, organizational development, collaboration and support (Chaskin 2001; Chaskin et
al. 2002). These approaches all sought to build community capacity and human and social capital in disadvantaged communities and to connect them to structures of opportunity beyond the neighborhood. Auspos & Kubisch (2004) add strategies focused on resident engagement in planning, management and implementation. For example, engaging residents might include analyzing problems, assessing community strengths and weaknesses, exploring possible solutions, articulating what the community wants or does not want, and developing an agenda for change" (Auspos & Kubisch 2004).

2.8 Community building in practice

As community building gained widespread acceptance, practitioners became intentional about embedding it as an explicit and integral stage of project planning and development and dedicating staff explicitly for this work. For example, in the early 1980s, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI), a community-based organization (CBO) in Boston, utilized an extensive community organizing and resident engagement process to defeat the Boston Redevelopment Authority's (BRA) urban renewal plan, which called for the construction of two new office buildings that would demolish and gentrify the neighborhood. Their organizing efforts resulted in the eminent domain power for 30 acres of land in Boston's Roxbury neighborhood (DSNI website).

In the early 1990s, the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) created a specific Community Builder position to assist with the redevelopment of its New Holly HOPE VI redevelopment. The Community Builder was responsible for developing relationships with residents, engaging them in the redevelopment processes of their public housing communities and developing and implementing activities for resident interactions. After the tremendous success of that work, SHA increased the intentionality behind its practice. SHA has since grown its staff to six, one staff assigned to either one large public housing development or a collection of small developments (Seattle Housing Authority website). Community building activities have included cultural celebrations to committee meetings focused on neighborhood beautification and traffic safety (Burkholder et al. 2006).
The Community Builders (TCB), a Boston-headquartered nonprofit housing developer, has also created an explicit strategy around this work. Referred to as Community Life, the place-based model “uses stable housing as a platform for residents and neighborhoods to achieve success” and incorporates resident engagement strategies, including opportunities for problem-solving and leadership, into all of its work and focusing on four key practice areas: youth development, education, workforce development and asset building (The Community Builders website).

In the mid-2000s, modeled after SHA, San Francisco’s HOPE SF initiative created Community Builder positions for each of its four public housing sites. As described on the HOPE SF website, the main responsibilities for the Community Builders are “to develop relationships with residents, conduct asset mapping, identify challenges and engage residents in meaningful community building activities like leadership development, community projects and community meetings to identify needs and develop a shared vision for their community.” The initial thinking was that sites would spend some time doing community building and then eventually transition into service connection work (See figure 2.2 below). However, after several years of implementation, HOPE SF staff soon discovered that each site had a unique set of characteristics, which led to each of them redirecting their paths.

![Figure 2.2 HOPE SF's community building and service connection pathway](Source LFA 2012)
While these are just a handful of organizations and PHAs mentioned, it is worth mentioning that a host of other public housing authorities, development companies and social organizations have established community building as part of its work, though maybe not in the explicit title.

2.9 Assessing community building efforts

Some of the early research examining the effectiveness of community building interventions was documented in Kingsley et al (1997) “Community Building: Coming of Age.” In their report, they highlight the efforts of five traditions of community work by; (1) faith-based institutions and settlement houses, (2) mass-based community organizations, (3) structured citizen participation, (4) CBDOs and CDCs and (5) CCIs and found that the unifying theme among the various successful efforts was community building. They conclude that while “community building is not a panacea, [it] has made important differences in people’s lives, has enhanced opportunities for those impoverished and equip them much more powerfully to take advantage of opportunities that become available to them (vi).

Other research examining efforts to build community have largely revolved around public housing transformations and mixed-income developments. In many cases, efforts to build community largely rely on physical design strategies; while others utilize activities and tenant groups. In 2010 and subsequently in 2013, I co-authored two papers with researchers at the Urban Institute to summarize the findings of this research (see Levy, McDade & Dumlao 2010; Levy, McDade & Bertumen 2013). Through an extensive annotated bibliography of over 50 peer-reviewed journal articles, we examined—among other things—the extent of social interactions among residents across varying income levels.

We found that in spite of building housing of higher and lower incomes in close proximity to each other (either in a development or in a neighborhood), this has led to little interaction or meaningful integration across income groups (Levy, McDade & Bertumen 2013). Most studies that examined resident interactions in mixed-income developments found that relationships are more likely to form among people of similar incomes and housing tenures (Kleit 2005; Rosenbaum et al. 1998; Tach 2009). While some researchers found some interactions among varying income groups, these interactions were described as “superficial and infrequent.” For example, early studies of resident interaction in mixed-income developments found greetings to be fairly common but any exchanges of longer duration to be
limited (Brophy & Smith 1997; Rosenbaum et al. 1998). In fact, Brophy and Smith’s 1997 mixed-income study found that many respondents did not know the names of their immediate neighbors. More recent studies have had similar findings. For example, Brower’s 2009 study of three mixed-income public housing redevelopments in Baltimore found little resident interaction across income and tenure groups—owners and renters. Similarly, Chaskin & Joseph (2010) found little interaction and bonding among residents of varying incomes and tenures in three Chicago mixed-income developments. Finally, Kleit & Carnegie’s 2011 study found that residents who moved to a mixed-income development did not expand their social networks across income lines.

In a 2013 study completed by researchers at the National Initiative on Mixed Income Communities (NIMC), Joseph and Gress investigated the social dynamics among residents in 31 mixed-income developments across 31 cities in the U.S. and Canada. Among their many findings, of chief relevance to this research was confirmation that while respondents generally rated overall neighboring relationships as good, the strongest relationships were among residents of the same social and economic backgrounds and among those who live in public housing. Alternatively, the weakest relationships were those between renters and owners.

Studies conducted among residents of income-diverse neighborhoods have produced similar findings. In 2000, Popkin et al discussed the relative scarcity and superficiality of interactions across residents within income-diverse neighborhoods. Clampet-Lundquist (2004) that found that women who were relocated to lower poverty neighborhoods faced barriers forming social ties. Briggs’ (2005) ethnographic work in Yonkers found few indicators of meaningful interactions among people living in mixed-income neighborhoods.

In instances where residents experienced negative interactions; these were often attributed to differences in behavior associated with income or class. For example, studies in New Orleans and Chicago found that unsubsidized residents complained about the behaviors of subsidized residents, and

11 Their framing of “social dynamics” builds on their collaborative seven-year mixed-income study with colleagues at the University of Chicago. They define “social dynamics” as including social interaction, community building, social control and governance.
subsidized residents reported feeling disrespected by unsubsidized residents and/or by management staff (Chaskin & Joseph 2010; Libson 2007). When interactions escalated to larger problems, Chaskin & Joseph (2011) found that higher income residents tended to rely on formal methods of social control such as calling the police, rather than informal methods, such as speaking directly to the people involved. Some higher income residents reported giving up on efforts to interact with lower income residents altogether because higher income residents felt unwelcomed and that the extent of social distance was too great to overcome (Chaskin & Joseph 2010). These were confirmed in Joseph & Gress’ 2013 study, which found that on-site social frictions were generated by differences in resident backgrounds, lifestyle choices and mindsets.

While there have been efforts documented to encourage resident engagement and interaction, these have often reinforced income and class divisions. For example, while developers created and organized regular tenant meetings, these meetings have often been split into two different meetings—one for homeowners and another for renters. Not only does this arrangement reinforce tenure differences, but it also reduces the amount of interactions that could happen among residents of different tenures, if there was broader meeting for all tenants. This also occurs when developers organize activities during the daytime, when residents—likely higher-income—are at work. Again, this reinforces differences of employment statuses and fosters interactions primarily among those of the same socioeconomic statuses. Similarly, while there has been literature that point to events around children having positive impacts for bridging income-diverse communities, this is also limiting engagement among households with children. This might leave out singles, empty nesters, seniors or families with older children.

The literature points to several factors—at the individual and structural level—that attribute to the limited interaction among income-diverse residents. For example, Kleit (2005) and Joseph (2008) found that a lack of common areas, shared building entrances or other design elements limited the amount of informal interactions that could occur among residents. Kleit (2005) also noted that differences in language, educational attainment, race and ethnicity, marital status and family composition also are factors that encourage or discourage resident interaction. A couple of studies found that an important barrier revolves around perceptions of difference—in that higher income residents hold negative stereotypes of public housing residents and subsidized residents perceive higher income residents as standoffish (Chaskin & Joseph 2010; Chaskin & Joseph 2011). Other factors include lower-income
residents wanting to maintain “a low profile” so as to avoid scrutiny of neighbors and any problems that might jeopardize their housing and the low level of expectation among the different groups for developing relationships. Residents’ perceptions of the development also influences interactions. For example, residents who viewed the development more negatively—mostly the higher income residents new to the area—were less engaged than those who held a positive view of the area, who were more likely to be lower income residents. Chaskin & Joseph 2010 also found that attempts at promoting social cohesion in mixed income developments have been challenging because of uneven participation at community events and practical limitations, such as meeting times.

Joseph & Gress (2013) also note that while most respondents agreed intentional planning for social relations in development design, staffing and activities is important to the successful functioning of mixed-income developments, many respondents expressed concern that sufficient resources, capacity, and time were not available to effectively promote strong social relations. And, they conclude that the repercussions are detrimental: “Failure to address the social dynamics of mixed-income developments could make the redevelopment efforts less sustainable, desirable mixed environments over the long term” (3).
Chapter 3

Trauma Informed Community Building: A new approach

In this section, I provide an overview of the Trauma Informed Community Building model. In particular, I discuss its inception and context of development as well as its approach, strategies and principles. For a detailed description of the model, including the evidence base undergirding its work, consult the 2014 white paper by Weinstein et al, “Trauma Informed Community Building: A Model for Strengthening Community in Trauma Affected Neighborhoods.” I conclude this section with a brief discussion of TICB’s early dissemination throughout the field and a forthcoming evaluation being completed to measure its effectiveness.

3.1 Inception

Formally launched in 2014, Trauma Informed Community Building (TICB) is a new approach to strengthening communities that have been impacted by high levels of trauma. TICB was created in partnership between BRIDGE Housing Corporation (BRIDGE), a 30-year old affordable housing developer in the U.S. Pacific Northwest with a portfolio of over 21,000 housing units, and San Francisco State University’s (SFSU) Health Equity Institute (HEI), a research institute that links science to community practice in pursuit of health equity and justice. The model is based off of BRIDGE’s six years of community building experience at Potrero Terrace-Annex public housing in the Potrero Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. BRIDGE’s redevelopment work at Potrero Terrace-Annex is part of San Francisco’s HOPE SF initiative, a public-private partnership led by the San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) to rebuild some of the most distressed public housing across the city with an intentional strategy for community building.
3.2 Context

The authors of TICB recognized that existing community building strategies were not sufficient when working with vulnerable and marginalized communities, particularly the deeply impoverished. And with the many neighborhood revitalization efforts currently underway across the country under CNI and RAD and more anticipated in the pipeline—as well as the general acceptance that community building is an essential component for equitable and sustainable revitalization efforts—an effective community building framework specific to these communities is critical for the field. TICB authors use a combination of Naparstek et al’s (1997) definition, which describes community building as “the active participation of residents in the process of strengthening community networks, programs and institutions” and McNeely’s (1999) and Chaskin’s (1999) definition, which states that “Unlike traditional programs and services, which direct interventions to the individual, community building is an engagement process for building social capital and the community’s investment in its own future.”

3.3 Trauma and its impact on traditional community building strategies

BRIDGE’s work in Potrero Hill cast light on the fact that many low-income and public housing communities do not effectively engage with traditional community building strategies—i.e., community BBQs, asset mapping exercises and tenant association groups. Why so? Because of what they argue are cumulative and adverse effects of trauma (see figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1 How trauma surrounds three components of neighborhood revitalization strategies
The authors’ review of the literature highlights that low-income and public housing communities have been traumatized from historic concentrated poverty, high levels of violence and decades of structural racism, marginalization and disinvestment, not to mention having had numerous broken promises and served by weak, low-capacity organizations. They also acknowledge that trauma is not limited to past trauma, but that many low-income communities are facing ongoing trauma in their daily lives, and in the case of development projects, are about to face drastic disruption resulting from either living on-site during demolition and construction, possibly having to relocate off-site or in a new unit in their development temporarily or permanently, or having to adjust to new neighbors and a drastically physically-transformed community. Collectively, these varying levels of trauma create, what they describe as six critical barriers to community building—those including:

1. A lack of trust and social cohesion, which prevents residents from attending community events or meetings;
2. A lack of stability, reliability and consistency, which makes residents not believe promises will be realized;
3. An inability to vision the future, which hinders residents’ ability to vision a better future or that change will ever happen because of the overwhelm of their current;
4. Disempowerment and a lack of a sense of community ownership, which makes residents feel their participation does not have power in community change;
5. A high level of personal needs, in which everyday stresses are so consuming that they can barely focus on anything beyond their immediate needs; and finally,
6. The depth and breadth of community needs, which involves an incredibly deep need and a very limited capacity and resource base.  

These effects—taken either on their own or in combination with one another—have negative impacts on individuals’ mental health, trust levels and overall wellbeing, and when scaled up to the community, has broader negative impacts. Ultimately the trauma “undermines the readiness for individual and

13 While there are five challenges listed from pages 7-9; the table on page 6 indicates six challenges, which is what I use in this thesis.
community change—the extent to which community is prepared and inclined to take collective action on an issue” (Oetting et al. 1995). Figure 3.2 illustrates examples of traditional community building strategies (in the first left-hand column), examples of each strategy (in the middle column) and examples of how trauma challenges these strategies/examples (in the right-hand column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGES TO TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY BUILDING STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY BUILDING STRATEGIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Social Networks: A thriving community has a strong social fabric, woven together by the connections between people. Building social networks is an essential piece of strengthening a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage residents in planning and vision setting: Community building efforts often turn to community members to envision solutions to community problems and determine community issues and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage community capacity to solve collective problems: Existing community groups may be enlisted to address community issues or new groups may be created to tackle common concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with systems and organizations to improve social and community outcomes. As part of community building efforts, city agencies, local foundations and other institutions often seek out partnerships with community representatives and organizations to fund and implement programs and services that meet resident needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of personal needs: Residents face daily stresses in their lives that make it hard for them to focus beyond their immediate needs. Therefore participating in community change is not a priority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2 Chart of how trauma challenges traditional community building strategies
Source Weinstein et al. 2014
3.4 TICB’s approach

Similar to how there is trauma-informed “service delivery,” the authors argue there should be trauma-informed “community building.” According to Harris and Fallot, a program or intervention is “trauma-informed” when it has an understanding of the ongoing impact of trauma on community members’ lives, and when all aspects of its response aim to appropriately address their specific needs and avoid re-traumatization (2001). It is important to note that trauma-informed programs and interventions do not treat trauma directly; rather it is an approach that “welcomes community members, acknowledges their special needs, and has the capacity to identify trauma and its relation to other issues in their lives” (Weinstein et al. 2014, 11).

With this foundation, the authors propose a model that understands the challenges and promotes strategies for helping the community heal. Figure 3.3 presents a theory of change model for TICB that proposes strategies that recognize trauma, de-escalate chaos and stress, foster resiliency and strengthen social connections. The authors hypothesize that these strategies will increase individuals’ “readiness for change,” which ultimately lays the foundation and support for effective program and service delivery and for sustainable individual and community change. These two outcomes are what they argue are critical particularly when trauma-impacted communities are faced with major changes like housing and/or neighborhood reconstruction.
3.5 Principles

There are four underlying principles in their model that reflect the beliefs and practices of a resident-centered approach. In brief, they include:

1. **Do no harm**, which means being aware of past and current trauma and promoting activities, programs and services that avoid re-traumatizing individuals and the community. In practice, this entails only engaging in activities when financial sustainability and organizational structure is guaranteed for multiple years and is not focused on short-term activities.

2. **Acceptance**, which implies meeting residents where they are, accepting the realities of their conditions and setting realistic expectations. In practice, this means setting goals that allow residents to grow, but does not push them past their capacity or understanding of an issue.

3. **Community empowerment**, which involves recognizing the importance of self-determination to encourage community investment and that everyone can play a supportive role. In practice, this includes providing opportunities for residents to feel control over the change they are experiencing and opportunities for peer support.

4. **Reflective process**, which takes a sustained approach such that improved outcomes carry over from generation to generation. In practice, this involves constantly evolving and responding to new developments of knowledge and needs and voices of the community. It is also building a foundation for coordinated community development and the delivery of programs and services and TICB activities continue throughout all the development phases.

3.6 Strategies

Grounded in public health's social-ecological model, which portrays the interconnectedness of individuals with the social and environmental dynamics that influence them, including interpersonal, community and system factors, TICB proposes a set of intentional stages at each level of the ecological
model so as to have the greatest impact on community outcomes and to ensure their sustainability. Figure 3.4 illustrates the four principles and strategies at each level of the ecological framework.

At the individual-level, TICB suggests engaging strategies that:

- Accept the experiences and circumstances of individuals
- Develop authentic relationships
- Allow for multiple touches and interactions
- Provide incentives and tangible rewards
- Set realistic expectations and does not over promise

At the interpersonal-level, TICB recommends strategies that:

- Provide opportunities that cultivate shared positive experiences
- Support peer-to-peer activities and interactions
- Create opportunities for personal sharing and mutual support
- Model healthy behaviors
At the community-level, TICB proposes strategies that:

- Expand incrementally, building from success
- Require sustainability and quality of community efforts
- Provide visible tangible activities that reflect community change
- Cultivate community leadership through support and skill building

Finally, at the systems-level, TICB suggests strategies that:

- Reflect community voices and priorities to stakeholders
- Build partnerships for long-term investments in community change and effective service delivery
- Advance long-term community vision and develop community-wide strategies to reach goals

3.7 Implementation and dissemination of TICB

As mentioned above, TICB was created based off of BRIDGE’s six years of community building experience at Potrero Terrace-Annex, which will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. And as of this writing, it is the only site implementing TICB. However, since its release late 2014, TICB has been recognized as a promising practice by researchers and practitioners. For example, the Urban Institute, a Washington, DC-based policy think tank recognized TICB as a “best and promising example” (2014); a community in Richmond, Virginia expressed interest in the model (Health and Wellness Action Team: Community Building, 2015); and BRIDGE staff have been invited to present their work at multiple conferences, including MIT’s Planning Practices that Matter: Housing of Resilient Cities symposium in the fall of 2013; San Diego Housing Federation 23rd Annual Affordable Housing Conference in 2014, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health’s 13th annual conference in 2014 and Housing California Conference in 2015 and webinars including a co-sponsored one by HUD and the Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP) as part of its Choice Neighborhood series in 2014.

3.8 Evaluation of TICB

Finally, through a grant from AECF, BRIDGE is working with SFSU’s HEI to both evaluate the impacts of TICB thus far and to establish baseline metrics to confirm the group’s anecdotal successes. The
evaluation will also examine the potential to replicate TICB in other communities, particularly at the three other HOPE SF sites. The final report is due to AECF in the summer of 2015.
Chapter 4

TICB for San Francisco’s Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex public housing

This section begins with a brief overview of the history and context of the Potrero Hill neighborhood in San Francisco. It then shifts to a discussion about the evolution of BRIDGE’s TICB framework and kinds of activities and processes being implemented under TICB at Potrero Terrace-Annex.

4.1 History of Potrero Hill

Located on the southeastern portion of San Francisco, east of the Mission District and south of South of Market (SOMA), the 1.52 square mile Potrero Hill neighborhood is known for its elevated terrains and spectacular views of the San Francisco Bay and city skyline (figure 4.1). Two freeways on its eastern and western boundaries bind it and its close proximity to many destination spots makes for an ideal home to over 14,000 residents and numerous businesses.

Figure 4.1 Context map of the Potrero Hill neighborhood in San Francisco  
Source: Bing maps

In the early 1700s much of Potrero Hill was uninhabited land, used sporadically by Native Americans as hunting ground. By the late 1700s, Spanish missionaries grazed cattle on the hill, naming it “Potrero Nuevo,”
translated in Spanish as “new pasture.” By the mid-1800s, Potrero Nuevo was granted to the de Haro family and in 1849, when Don Francisco de Haro died, squatters began to take over the land. Not long after, prospectors began dividing it into tracts and selling lots during the Gold Rush (BRIDGE, 2014b).

With the opening of Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), the San Francisco Bay Area utility company, and various industry, including gunpowder and iron factories, shipyards and warehouses in the 1850s, blue-collar workers began moving into the area. And, a little over a decade later, with then-President Abraham Lincoln’s signing into law the Pacific Railway Act, the building of the first transcontinental railroad fueled land speculation and quickly sped up development (BRIDGE 2014b). Portions of the eastern and southern parts of the hill were cut away for railway right-of-ways, and the fill was used to extend the shoreline. Around the same time, the construction of the Long Bridge, built over Mission Bay, was underway (Chinchilla 2013). Figures 4.2 and 4.3 capture historic images of development in Potrero Hill.

At the beginning of the 1900s, an influx of new residents searching for new homes appeared, because Potrero Hill avoided much of the devastation of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. A large concentration of European immigrants had settled, diversifying the neighborhood with Russian, Italian, Scots, Swiss, Serbians and Slovenian immigrants (BRIDGE 2014b and Chinchilla 2013). The different ethnic groups divided the Hill into several smaller neighborhoods; there was Russian Hill, Irish Hill, Scotch Hill and Dutchman’s Flat (BAYCAT 2010). The population shift resulted in the growing needs of the neighborhood and warranted the construction in 1922 of the Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, in
short known as the “NABE.” Designed by Julia Morgan, the NABE is a historic community center created as a gathering space for the Potrero community that provides ongoing programs and services to Potrero residents” (BRIDGE 2014b, 15). Figure 4.4 captures former executive director, Enola Maxwell, standing in front of the NABE.

The initiation of World War II (WWII) brought a further transformation of the area. Under then-President Franklin Roosevelt’s Housing Act of 1937—also known as the Wagner-Steagall Act—the federal government authorized $500 million in loans to local public housing authorities (PHA) to construct low-cost housing throughout the country. The act also provided a framework for the establishment of municipal housing authorities, such as the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA), to fulfill the role of overseeing local projects financed through the Act. As wartime efforts increased and labor and shipyard workers moved into units on the eastern and southern sides of Potrero Hill, SFHA used its federal funding “to create housing for war-industry workers streaming into the city” (BRIDGE 2014b, 35).

Potrero Terrace, a 469-unit development that sits on the southern side of the Hill, was among the first of five public housing developments constructed by the SFHA as temporary housing to accommodate wartime workers (figure 4.5).
Then, three additional public housing developments were erected nearby. Two of those projects included the 27-building Wisconsin Project (at 24th and Carolina Streets) and the other; the 13-building Carolina Project—nicknamed “the 13 Colonies”—bordered by 18th, 19th, Carolina and De Haro Streets (figures 4.6 and 4.7).

During WWII, “additional units were hastily added to Potrero Terrace to accommodate war-industry workers, resulting in the 137-unit Potrero Annex (at 22nd and Missouri Streets)” (figure 4.8) (BRIDGE 2014b, 36). In total, four properties: the Wisconsin Project, Carolina project; Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex occupied majority of the southern side of the Hill.
As a means of reducing the cost of soil cuts and fill, the public housing developments were constructed on “benches,” cut out of the steep slopes following the land’s natural topography (figures 4.9 and 4.10). “While this method created efficiencies at the time, the resulting street configuration—representing a marked departure from the typical San Francisco grid — resulted in the physical and social isolation of the project residents from the rest of Potrero Hill” (BAYCAT 2010). Additionally, federally mandated racial quotas kept public housing segregated after the war. The justification was to keep neighborhood patterns of racial makeup. However, in 1948, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled these practices “unconstitutional” (BAYCAT 2010).

Soon after further industry, including U.S. Steel, Union Iron Works, Western Sugar Refinery and Bethlehem Shipbuilding Company, settled in the area. A mix of residential and industrial areas characterized the area. Following the economic boom of WWII and the increase in suburbanization, the Hill, like many urban areas, experienced a significant economic decline. Over the years, the Potrero Hill neighborhood steadily transformed, as many higher-income individuals moved into the neighborhood.

By the 1960s, many artists and members from the LGBT community had moved to Potrero Hill, drawn by its central location and affordable rents. Many artist studios, showrooms and art schools were set up nearby in response to the explosion as a “creative hub.” Around the same time, some Potrero Hill residents fought to tear down some of the public housing on the Hill and to turn the Carolina projects into a public junior high school. After heated battles, the residents campaigning to have public housing
torn down won and the Wisconsin and Carolina Projects were razed to make way for Starr King Elementary School and Potrero Hill Junior High, which became Enola D. Maxwell Middle School, then International Studies Academy. In the mid-1980s, when Parkview Heights, a 120-unit townhome Planned Unit Development (PUD) was constructed on the south side at 25th, 26th, De Haro and Wisconsin Streets by the City of San Francisco in partnership with private developers, Starr King Open Space was created as part of mitigation (Parkview Heights website).

The following decade, the construction of the Victoria Mews condominium complex in 1978 signaled the beginning of gentrification on the Hill (BAYCAT 2010). Then, in the 1990s, the dot-com boom drove property values up and a host of live/work studio apartments sprouted throughout the Hill. Its central location and proximity to the bustling SOMA and Financial District attracted many working professionals and eventually the North side of the Hill shifted to primarily white-collared professionals and middle- to upper-income families. And, while the South side experienced some of the same transition, not all parts of the south side, specifically Potrero Terrace-Annex, did. Figure 4.11 outlines some rough boundaries of the North and South sides, taken from BRIDGE 2014)

![Figure 4.11 North and South side communities in Potrero Hill](Source Bing Maps)
4.2 The North and South sides of Potrero Hill: Demographic, socioeconomic and contextual factors

The North side has become one of the city’s most expensive and sought-after residential areas with homes listing from $750,000-$1.5 million and a three-block segment lined with trendy cafes, boutiques, organic grocery stores and restaurants. The South side, not including Potrero Terrace-Annex has experienced a similar boom with home values rising, new condominium developments sprouting up and the revitalization of the thriving Dogpatch commercial strip. However, a portion of the South side, which Potrero Terrace-Annex public housing occupies, remains an island of poverty and Potrero Terrace-Annex residents face numerous economic and social hardships, in sharp contrast to the rest of the North and South side communities. According to some of my stakeholder interviews, some even argued that there are three distinct Hill communities: the North side, South side and Potrero Terrace-Annex. One South side resident distinguished the three communities as the wealthy North side, the middle, working-class South side and the impoverished Potrero Terrace-Annex development. Figure 4.12 situates Potrero Terrace-Annex and outlines the boundaries of its development.

For example, North side households have a median household income that is more than ten times Potrero Terrace-Annex residents ($135,000 vs. $14,000) and the poverty rate among Potrero Terrace-
Annex residents is more than 11 times greater than North Side residents (BRIDGE 2014b). Negative perceptions around safety further contribute to the divide. The community has a violent crime rate on property that is five times the city average (Weinstein 2013) and these negative perceptions deter residents from the surrounding Potrero Hill from venturing into the public housing development (Chinchilla 2013).

However, the divide between the development and the rest of the Hill is not merely social and economic, it is also the result of geographic isolation, poor transportation connectivity and poor access to services and amenities. For example, while the North side enjoys connectivity to the downtown’s existing street grid, the South side is dominated by steep topography, poorly designed, curving and diagonal cul-de-sacs that do not connect to the downtown’s existing street grid. Also, in an analysis conducted by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH), researchers found that zero percent of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents are within one-half mile of a food store; compared to 65 percent of San Francisco residents (Chinchilla 2013). The same assessment also found that there are no dry cleaners, hardware stores, post offices, video rentals or movie theatres within one-half mile of Potrero Terrace-Annex.

4.3 From HOPE VI to HOPE SF

By the early 1990s, the City had recognized the growing physical, social and economic disparities at Potrero Terrace-Annex and applied to HUD for a HOPE VI revitalization grant. In 1993, SFHA received its first HOPE VI revitalization grant, which was intended to redevelop Potrero Terrace-Annex and Plaza East. However, due to strong resident resistance to the proposal, SFHA dropped Potrero Terrace-Annex from its proposal and replaced it with Bernal Dwellings (Chinchilla 2013). Nearly 15 years after the City’s first attempt, the City has returned to its vision to redevelop Potrero Terrace-Annex under its public housing revitalization initiative, HOPE SF. However, this time, the City (and selected master developer) has gained support from residents and the surrounding community to move forward with its redevelopment proposal.
4.4 Brief evolution of HOPE SF

Beginning in the early 2000s, the City examined the needs of some of the poorest area of the city—southeast San Francisco. First, in 2002, SFHA commissioned an independent assessment of the physical needs of its properties. The study revealed a backlog of immediate needs totaling $195 million. It also suggested that an average of $26.6 million per year in additional physical deterioration would compound in SFHA communities if the current problems were not addressed. A few years later in 2005, San Francisco’s Human Services Agency (HSA) completed a study to better understand the conditions and patterns emerging among vulnerable families involved in multiple systems of care. When researchers mapped out where system-involved families were living, they found that the majority of children removed from their families and placed in the care of the child welfare system lived within short walking distance of seven street corners, hence the name “Seven Street Corners Study.” Five of the seven street corners were adjacent to public housing sites: Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Potrero Annex-Terrace, Sunnydale and Westside Courts.

Soon after, in the fall of 2006, then-mayor Gavin Newsom and then-Board of Supervisor (BOS) Sophie Maxwell commissioned the HOPE SF Task Force (Task Force) to brainstorm how the City could develop a local HOPE VI-like program in response to its recent studies. The Task Force, which reflected the city’s new direction of equity and inclusion, comprised of public housing residents, city commissioners, community activities, and business and community leaders (HOPE SF Task Force 2007). With the dismantling of traditional public housing programs and the shrinking funding—and eventually dissolution—of HOPE VI, local municipalities across the country were faced with the challenge of how to preserve and address the capital needs of their existing public housing stock. And, for cities like San Francisco, where there are strong real estate markets, high development costs, land constraints and areas where public housing currently exist are in increasingly sought after tourist and gentrifying neighborhoods, devising a preservation and redevelopment strategy presents further challenges.

Gleaning from the lessons learned from past HOPE VI redevelopment efforts nationally—namely, Atlanta, Seattle and Portland—but also of the Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) placed-based initiative and from its own experiences, the HOPE SF Task Force devised a strategy that became HOPE SF (HOPE SF Task Force 2007). After a year of meetings, in March 2007, the Task Force delivered a set of...
recommendations outlining how the city could improve its public housing. Among its recommendations were a set of prescriptions including overarching program goals and development guidelines (figures 4.13 and 4.14).

Four overarching goals
1. Build superior housing
2. Enhance the lives of existing
3. Serve as a catalyst for improving the surrounding neighborhood
4. Advance the knowledge in the field nationally about best practices in public housing revitalization and community developments

Eight development guidelines
1. Ensure no loss of public housing
2. Create an economically-integrated community
3. Maximize the creation of new affordable housing
4. Involve residents in the highest levels of participation in the entire process
5. Provide economic opportunities through the rebuilding process
6. Integrate process with neighborhood improvement revitalization plans
7. Create environmentally-sustainable and accessible communities
8. Build a strong sense of community

Figures 4.13 and 4.14 (left to right) HOPE SF's goals and development guidelines
Source: HOPE SF

Finally, they also identified eight public housing developments located in four neighborhoods in the southeast quadrant of the city—Bayview Hunter’s Point (Hunters View and Alice Griffith), Potrero Hill (Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex), Western Addition and Visitacion Valley (Sunnydale) (figure 4.15).
4.4 The launch of HOPE SF

In 2008, the City formally launched HOPE SF as a public-private-philanthropic partnership led by the City of San Francisco’s (City) then-Mayor’s Office of Housing (MOH) (now Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)) and San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) in partnership with The San Francisco Foundation (TSFF) and Enterprise Community Partners (Enterprise). The City and selected master developers are leading the “physical” side of the redevelopment, while TSFF and Enterprise are leading the “people” side of the redevelopment. TSFF and Enterprise established the Partnership for HOPE SF (formerly Campaign for HOPE SF), which is an integrated approach to fund human capital work, particularly, the intergenerational poverty in the Bayview, Potrero Hill and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods and has a goal of raising $30 million (Weinstein 2013).

Two other HOPE SF partners include Learning For Action (LFA), a San Francisco-based social research and consulting organization, and the Health Equity Institute (HEI), a San Francisco State University research institute focused on social epidemiology and environmental justice. LFA is leading a five-year HOPE SF evaluation and released its first report, a baseline study, in 2012. Meanwhile, HEI is leading the HOPE SF Learning Center, which involves providing ongoing research, training and process evaluations and communicating what is working (or not) across HOPE SF sites.

HOPE SF prides itself as being unique from HOPE VI in that: (1) it is being led by the City’s MOHCD in partnership with SFHA and other public-private partners (including nine city departments)\(^\text{14}\); (2) it began without federal dollars (seeded with City bonds and leveraging other public and private dollars), (3) it takes a collective impact approach (partners include nonprofits, business and philanthropic partners and has a citywide evaluation in place); and (4) it will minimize displacement (on-site relocation, phased construction) and guarantee one-for-one public housing replacement (Moss et al. 2014). To effectively collaborate across the numerous agencies and organizations, HOPE SF is governed by three primary leadership structures: The HOPE SF Oversight Committee, The HOPE SF Campaign Steering

---

\(^{14}\) Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF), Human Services Agency (HSA), Department of Public Health (DPH), Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), F5 Networks, Inc. (F5), San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), Adult Probation Department (APD) and Juvenile Probation Department (JPD)
Committee and The City Services Team—each comprised with key personnel across partners (Mercy Housing 2014).

Its overall strategy sets out to build over 5,000 new housing units—with one-for-one replacement of public housing units (2,500) and 1,000 new affordable and over 2,500 new market-rate units—as well as neighborhood-serving retail, community centers, parks and playgrounds. To support this work, then-mayor Gavin Newsom and then-Supervisor Sophie Maxwell authorized $95 million in general obligation funding to get HOPE SF underway. Each HOPE SF site was put out for bid to developers and the result includes four affordable housing and mission-driven developers to lead community engagement, financial packaging, and the reconstruction. They have also partnered with local and national nonprofit organizations to deliver social services and carry out other dimensions of the plan. The City completed the first phase of its first redevelopment site, Hunters View, early 2013 with a new 25-unit building (Said 2013).

4.4.1 Focus on community building

Recognizing that physical transformation alone is not sufficient to change neighborhoods or family and child outcomes, HOPE SF leaders prescribed that each site develop an intensive human capital development plan with the assistance of two critical staff: community builders and service connectors. At each site, developers hire Community Builders to focus on forging relationships with and facilitating “a sense of community” among residents; facilitating ongoing community building activities (e.g. cooking classes, a community garden, holiday parties); coordinating closely with the services connectors; and acting as liaisons between the property management company and the residents. They also engage residents on issues of importance and shared interest, such as public safety and neighborhood schools. Community Builders also engage residents in development process: they work to involve residents closely in site planning and decision-making. They also work closely with both property management and service connectors to develop and maintain partnerships with community-based organizations (LFA 2012).

Because HOPE SF leaders were not prescriptive as to how sites should implement their community building activities and kinds of activities sites should engage in, sites have tremendous latitude in what
and how they implement their efforts. As of this writing, activities have ranged from block parties, neighborhood watch groups, and events around sports, exercise and youth to activities that engage public housing residents in the redevelopment planning processes.

Figure 4.16 below illustrates HOPE SF’s pathway, or Resident Development Model, that HOPE SF leaders imagined the community building and service connections work would follow. The model starts with two phases of community building to lay the foundation—phase one to build trust and phase two to engage the community around a master planning process, which collectively will build social cohesion and empower residents. Then, the model transitions into two phases of service connection, which is expected to occur one year before reconstruction, beginning with a “light approach” to case management in that Service Connectors refer residents to existing programs and services, and then phase two, which is expected to happen post-reconstruction (no including during construction), is about programs and services (Weinstein 2013).

![Figure 4.16 HOPE SF’s community building and service connection model](source)

However, after several years of implementation, HOPE SF recognized that each site has a unique set of characteristics and therefore require a modified approach.
4.5 HOPE SF and Rebuild Potrero

In 2008, BRIDGE Housing Corporation (BRIDGE) was selected as the master developer of Potrero Terrace-Annex. Rather than contracting the community building (or service connections) work out to a social services organization, for example, BRIDGE kept the work in-house and implemented, what eventually evolved into TICB. The section that follows provides a brief overview of the Potrero Terrace-Annex history and demographics; a summary of the planning process and redevelopment plan “Rebuild Potrero” and then a deep dive into BRIDGE’s implementation of TICB.

4.6 History of Potrero Terrace-Annex

Originally built as two separate developments—Potrero Terrace in 1941 and Potrero Annex in 1955—what is now considered Potrero Terrace-Annex, stands as two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco (figure 4.17).

Occupying about 33 acres (38 acres when including public streets), or one-third, of the South side, with U.S. 101 to the west and U.S. 280 to the east as well as 20th Street to the north and 25th and 26th Streets to the south, the area is characterized by its steep topography and windy streets, which oftentimes lead to dead-ends (figure 4.18). The unique and discontinuous street grid prevents for a
continuous, fluid and integration development in the larger neighborhood’s fabric. The 50-year old utilities and older style overhead power telephone and cable lines are also in dire need of replacement. “The large sodium lights, stark absence of trees, utilitarian paint colors and isolation from the surrounding community leave no doubt that these developments are public housing” (BRIDGE 2014b, 35).

Figure 4.18 Aerial view of Potrero Terrace-Annex at present
Source BAYCAT 2010

Terrace buildings are characterized by three-story concrete structures with tiled hipped roofs; while Annex buildings are wood construction with flat roofs. Originally constructed as temporary, barracks-style housing for veterans returning WWII, the buildings were quickly and hastily constructed and now suffer from “poor structural conditions, functional obsolescence, design deficiencies and infrastructure deterioration” (figures 4.19 and 4.20) (BRIDGE 2014b, 37).

Figures 4.19 and 4.20 (left to right) Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex at present
Source BRIDGE 2014b
Among renovation concerns, they are also in need of major modernization to align with ADA compliance (An in-depth analysis of the existing conditions can be found in Rebuild Potrero Transformation Plan, Appendix 05: Design Standards and Guidelines). Over time, the community struggled with disinvestment [low-quality, uncoordinated services] and in the last few decades been a source of tension between residents in Potrero Terrace-Annex and the surrounding community. Additionally, its two elementary schools are underperforming. Residents have limited access to healthy food options within walking distance.

Figure 4.22 Potrero Terrace-Annex development footprint
Source Bing Maps

Figures 4.23 and 4.24 Current conditions of Potrero Terrace-Annex development
Source BRIDGE 2014b
However, its more positive assets include a plethora of amenities, including the NABE, a recently renovated Potrero Hill Public Library branch, Potrero Hill Health Clinic, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Family Resource Center, Urban YMCA and several open spaces (figure 4.25).

Figure 4.25 Potrero Terrace-Annex neighborhood amenities
Source Bing Maps
4.7 Potrero Terrace-Annex resident demographics today

According to LFA’s 2012 HOPE SF Baseline Report, in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010/2011, there were 517 households, comprising 1,280 residents on lease at Potrero Terrace-Annex (table 4.1). Weinstein (2013) suggests a more realistic estimate ranges from 2,000 to 2,500 residents, accounting for those off-lease. The average household size was 2.5 people and the average number of children per household was 1.7. Over 60 percent (63 percent) of residents are female, the remaining 37 percent male. African Americans comprise the largest ethnic group at 43 percent; while Whites, Hispanics and Asians make up the next most populous groups at 24 percent, 15 percent and 11 percent, respectively. Over time, Weinstein (2013) says these figures have shifted to about 60 percent African American and 20 percent Latino.

Table 4.1. Demographic characteristics of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents (FY 2010/2011)

| Households | No. of residents | 1280 |
| No. of households | 517 |
| Average no. of individuals per household | 2.5 |
| Percent of households with children | 65% |
| Average no. of children (in households with children) | 1.7 |
| Gender | Male residents | 37% |
| Female residents | 63% |
| Age distribution | 0-5 years old | 15% |
| 6-15 years old | 26% |
| 16-24 years old | 17% |
| 25-64 years old | 38% |
| 65+ years old | 4% |
| Ethnicity | African American | 43% |
| White | 24% |
| Hispanic | 15% |
| Asian | 11% |
| Pacific Islander | 5% |
| Native American | 1% |
| Multi-racial | 1% |

Source LFA 2012

In terms of socioeconomic characteristics, only 30 percent of residents earn income from work (as opposed to obtaining income from government sources), which is low compared to other San Francisco public housing residents. Sixty-two percent of Terrace residents and 44 percent of Annex residents
receive public assistance; and many receive food stamps (70 percent and 60 percent, respectively). Of those who were working in FY 2010/2011, the average annual income per household was $14,028. Compared to the nearly 90 percent of San Francisco residents (over 18 years old) who graduate from high school, less than one-fifth (16 percent) of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents (over 18 years old) have graduated from high school. Fifty-three percent of Potrero Terrace-Annex elementary-school age children are chronically absent, meaning missing over 10 percent of school days each academic year. Finally, among three- to four-year old children, only one-third attends pre-school (Weinstein 2013).

Table 4.2. Economic characteristics of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents (FY 2010/2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial and employment status</th>
<th>Dollar / Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual income per household</td>
<td>$14,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of households below federal poverty line</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of able-bodied adults who were employed in FY 2010/2011 (ages 18-64)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public benefits</th>
<th>Dollar / Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent on Cal-Fresh¹⁵</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent on Medi-Cal¹⁶</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent on CalWORKS¹⁷</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent on County Adult Assistance Programs (CAAP)¹⁸</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent on Social Security</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source LFA 2012

According to San Francisco’s Department of Public Health’s baseline assessment, in 2003-2005, the 94107 zip code, which includes Potrero Terrace-Annex residents, had far higher rates of acute care hospitalizations for adult and pediatric asthma, diabetes, lung disease and heart failure when compared

---

15 California’s federally-funded food stamp program that offers low-income families and individuals a monthly voucher that can be used to buy groceries, produce at participating farmers markets and prepared meals at participating restaurants.

16 California’s Medicaid welfare program serving low-income individuals, including but not limited to: families, seniors, persons with disabilities, children in foster care, pregnant women and childless adults with incomes below 138% the federal poverty level.

17 Administered by HAS, CalWORKS is California’s version of the federal welfare-to-work program for low-income adults with dependent children. Clients receive a monthly cash grant funded in part by the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program.

18 Administered by HAS, CAAP is unique to San Francisco, and is the general assistance programs for indigent adults without dependent children. CAAP determines eligibility and issues benefits to clients who are not eligible for other state or federal cash aid programs.
to San Francisco. These four chronic diseases are considered ambulatory care sensitive (ACS) conditions: conditions for which hospitalization can usually be prevented when they have been effectively managed in outpatient settings. High rates of ACS conditions indicate poor access to or use of outpatient health care.

Table 4.3 Hospitalization Rates, per 1,000 people (2003-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Zip code 94107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult and pediatric asthma</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source BRIDGE administrative data

Through a HEI mental health assessment, researchers found high rates of depression and substance abuse due to high levels of daily stressors and chaos in Potrero Terrace-Annex residents’ lives. This has minimized caregiver’s ability to take care for their families and thus has had negative impacts on family cohesion. HEI researchers also found that Potrero Terrace-Annex residents view existing neighborhood programs as “uncoordinated, temporary and not integrated into the community” (Weinstein 2013).

Finally, various types of crime haunt the Potrero Terrace-Annex community with property crime rates trumping the other three HOPE SF sites.

Table 4.4 Neighborhood crime rates, per 1,000 people (2005-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potrero Terrace-Annex</th>
<th>Hunters View</th>
<th>Alice Griffith</th>
<th>Sunnydale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical assaults</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assaults</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crimes</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source LFA 2012
4.8 Rebuild Potrero Plans

4.8.1 The planning process

Beginning late 2008, BRIDGE engaged in an extensive community process with the aim of developing an equitable and responsive redevelopment plan. BRIDGE hired a coordinator to carry out both the community building and engagement work. The coordinator’s work involved developing an outreach list, putting together a series of communitywide events and six resident focus groups; building an on-site community garden and creating a regular community meeting group—which evolved into the Community Building Group (CBG) and will be discussed in greater detail in the following section).

BRIDGE’s community process involved a focus on the “physical” redevelopment of the area, including informational meetings for public housing residents, tours of affordable housing projects and open dialogues for residents to voice their concerns, their likes and dislikes about their existing housing and neighborhood and design charettes. The process also had a “human capital” component, including a two-part workshop led by a Community Builder from Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) and residents who experienced the New Holly HOPE VI redevelopment and a community building day, which included a tree and vegetable planting at Starr King Elementary School and the Family Resource Center.

Over the two-year span (between the summer of 2008 and the summer of 2010, BRIDGE staff engaged nearly 1,000 Potrero Terrace-Annex residents and stakeholders from all across the neighborhood in over 20 workshops, presentations and project tours between.¹⁹ BRIDGE had an intentional strategy to engage residents and stakeholders inside and outside of the public housing (Weinstein 2013b). By the end of the physical planning process in the summer 2010), community stakeholders developed a set of design “principles” and “goals” to reconfigure and integrate the Potrero Terrace-Annex site with the rest of the Potrero Hill neighborhood. Figures 4.26 and 4.27 outline them below.

¹⁹ See Figure 2 of Rebuild Potrero Transformation Plan for detailed Schedule of Community Meetings on pages 12-13.
4.8.2 Rebuild Potrero Transformation Plan

The product of the community process is the Rebuild Potrero Transformation Plan, a master plan to create a united Potrero Hill neighborhood by improving the current conditions of the Potrero Terrace-Annex community and seamlessly weaving it into the larger neighborhood. To do so, the plan calls for creating a thriving, mixed-income community that includes reorienting the street grid, connecting infrastructure and transportation, and improving access to the physical assets in the community. More specifically, it replaces all 606 current public housing units and creates 1,000 new mixed-income homes (400 affordable and 600 market rate). At the heart of the project is a new neighborhood center that will provide a mix of community facilities, spaces for services, a daycare and retail space. A plethora of open spaces is also at the center of the development and mixed throughout. Finally, the project will be built to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) standards. The pair of images below illustrates the existing and proposed plans (figures 4.28 and 4.29).

---

20 The determination of rental versus condominiums or a combination of both is still to be determined.
The second pair of images below illustrates the urban design and open space plans (figures 4.30 and 4.31).
4.8.3 Project timing

Rebuild Potrero is currently in predevelopment with the public entitlements and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) approval expected by late 2015 or early 2016. As of this writing, the project has not yet received final entitlements and approvals to move forward. According to BRIDGE staff, the Rebuild is expected to take 10 to 15 years to complete all planned phases.21

4.8.4 Rebuild Potrero PARADISE Plan

Through a HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative (CNI) planning grant, BRIDGE, in partnership with KDG Enterprises, Inc. (KDG) and community stakeholders, prepared a complementary plan, the PARADISE Plan (Practical and Realistic and Desirable Ideas for Social Enrichment) to address the “people” side of Rebuild Potrero (figure 4.32).

The CNI grant was awarded in 2012 and the final plan released late 2014. The plan, a product of extensive research and community engagement with community residents and stakeholders, investigates and offers recommendations to address five key program areas: (1) early childhood education, (2) K-12 education, (3) Economic security, (4) Health and wellness and (5) Public safety through...

---

extensive partnering with community-based organizations and program providers. It also lays out a theory of change and logic models with clear strategies addressing each program area. Cross cutting across each of the program areas are investments in TICB, case management and technology.  

To develop the plan, BRIDGE and KDG Enterprises established an advisory committee comprised of nominated Potrero Terrace-Annex residents and community stakeholders to lead the process; hired Potrero Terrace-Annex residents to conduct household surveys for a community needs assessment; analyzed household survey data; convened community meetings to share assessment findings and conducted best practices research and an assessment of implementation partners.

### 4.9 The evolution of Rebuild Potrero’s community building work

At the end of 2010, when a new Senior Community Builder (Emily Weinstein) transitioned in, the thinking around community building began to shift and the creation of TICB began to evolve. As Weinstein recollects, “Between 2008 and 2010, most of the emphasis was on the master plan process—[though] there were events and a Community Building Group. But it was in 2011, that we launched community building for community building’s sake.” There were several important shifts and revelations particularly around the understanding of the purpose and value of community building work, the many dimensions of traditional community building strategies, the challenges that interfere with traditional strategies, the implications when working with specific populations and how the work could be approached. However, Weinstein does note that while the first two years were not yet TICB, they still were important for laying the foundation and building the momentum for TICB.

---

22 See BRIDGE & KDG Enterprises’ 2014 PARADISE Plan for details about the planning and content of the plan.
Without prescriptive instructions from HOPE SF leadership as to how community building was defined, the kinds of activities that should be employed and the outcomes activities were expected to yield, Weinstein interpreted it to be about “developing relationships and developing trust with community members—public housing residents and the surrounding community and stakeholders.”

4.9.1 Current conditions before TICB

When Weinstein stepped in, she soon learned that the Potrero Terrace-Annex community had struggled with deep levels of trauma caused by the persistent and severe levels of violence, stress and chaos in residents’ everyday lives and extending at a larger scale to the community. Decades of layered trauma led to high rates of anxiety, depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), feelings of isolation and mistrust, high-risk behaviors, substance abuse and these needs and stress eclipsed their capacity to engage in nurturing family activities. There was also mistrust among neighbors within their development, with city agencies and organizations that serve them and therefore, a lack of social cohesion. There is also a culture of apathy and depression. And, at the institutional level, residents in public housing had been let down in the past by promises of change that had little or no result as well as uncoordinated and low-quality programs and services that were intended to serve their community.

4.9.2 Rebuild Potrero CBI Plan

With a better understanding of the depth of trauma and needs of individuals and the community, Weinstein assembled a plan, “Rebuild Potrero Community Building Initiative,” which laid out prescriptions for a community building approach, framework, structure and process—that moved beyond community building for the sake of developing a plan to community building for the sake of community building itself (2012). As Weinstein described in her 2013 presentation at MIT’s symposium, HOPE SF’s initial approach—the Resident Development Model—proved to be insufficient in the Potrero Terrace-Annex community. Potrero Terrace-Annex residents faced significant mental health problems and mistrust of existing service providers, so a “light touch” and service connector model would not be sufficient. Residents needed a deeper touch approach to improve their outcomes.
4.9.3 Approach and framework

As opposed to a needs-based approach, which she described as “perpetuating a system of dependence on outside service providers and does not build a community’s ability to affect change from within,” Weinstein proposed an asset-based approach, which involves “relying on the talents of individual community member, community institutions and collective resources” (2012). According to one excerpt of the plan, “The goal is to invest internally and create processes that connect and harness the community’s power. The asset-based approach ultimately empowers individuals to use their talents and skills and helps community institutions expand.” The graphic below illustrates the relationship among the community building process, strategies for increasing the community’s capacity and alignment with Potrero Terrace-Annex resident goals (figure 4.33).

To achieve these goals, she recognized the importance of four objectives: (1) To increase the community’s awareness and participation in the Rebuild Potrero process; (2) To develop the community’s capacity to work together to solve collective problems and develop institutions to implement projects
and activities; (3) To strengthen existing organizations’ and institutions’ ability to meet the needs of the community by reducing barriers and increasing access and connections to existing programs and services; and (4) To provide community leaders with formal and informal leadership opportunities and develop the potential of future community leaders and leadership structures (Weinstein 2012, 5)

To execute this plan, she devised two Community Builder positions: a Senior Community Builder23 and Junior Community Builder. Weinstein’s Senior Community Builder position had the primary responsibility of guiding the Initiative, by identifying resources, making connections to bridge information and opportunity gap among residents, building relationships, creating institutional structures to support projects, implementing activities, increasing the capacity of surrounding CBOs, developing programs and empowering residents with tools and leadership skills to sustain efforts.24 (Also, it is worth noting that as of fall 2014, a new Senior Community Builder, Thu Banh, has since taken Weinstein’s place.) The Junior Community Builder, who is a resident of Potrero Terrace-Annex and BRIDGE employee, serves as a liaison between the development team and residents and is primarily responsible for ongoing outreach to ensure resident participation and assistance in CBI activities.

She also established two organizing bodies: the Community Building Group (CBG) and a set of Action Teams. CBG meets every other month (though it started monthly) to: (1) Get status updates about the Rebuild Potrero project, (2) Hear about the continued efforts, updates and needs of community action teams, (3) Plan future Community Building events, and (4) Provide a social space for continued

23 The plan also called for a “Life Skills and Job Specialist,” however, I did not get to this in my research.
24 Late 2014, a new staff person transitioned into the Senior Community Builder position. In keeping with BRIDGE’s “trauma-sensitive” approach, it ensured an inclusive, transparent and as least-disruptive process. A 2014 report by Harder+Company documented this transition. BRIDGE staff carefully considered and designed a process to minimize the negative impact of these changes on the community, the relationship between BRIDGE and residents, and the redevelopment as a whole. Based on the principles of TICB, they prioritized the following values for interactions with the community: clear communication, an open and transparent process, resident engagement and phased transition in the community. As another point of continuity, the new Senior Community Builder had served on the consultant team for 1.5 years to develop the PARADISE Plan. Therefore, she had some community knowledge and was a familiar face to some residents. This also helped the leadership transition because the new director was a complete outsider. Another important component to the successful transition was the consistent presence in the Community Builder role, which has been occupied by the same resident for the past four years. Residents recognize the Community Builder as the “face of the project.” Despite change at the Program Director level, no programs stopped as the transition took place and the “boots on the ground” Community Builder remained a continuous and consistent link from BRIDGE to the residents.
interaction between community members from all sides of the Hill. Nine Action Teams were formed in 2011 to organize goals and activities around various issue areas.\textsuperscript{25,26}

4.9.4 Resident Get-Togethers

One of the first, and critical activities, Weinstein engaged in were “Get-Togethers,” which she described as modeled after “house parties.” “I needed a way to introduce myself to the community,” Weinstein explained. The Junior Community Builder was responsible for spreading the word to residents and generating interest about hosting a “Get Together” at their home. Residents invited five to 10 family members and friends and Weinstein facilitated discussions for residents to think about their skills and capacity to impact their community. She also guided residents in an asset mapping exercise that began with the skills and assets of the individuals in the room and transitioned into a discussion about the organizational and institutional resources in the community, and the pros and cons of each. Residents were also asked to write down their dreams for the community and anonymously place them in the “Dream Box.”\textsuperscript{27} Finally, residents completed a survey, which asked about their demographics, use and access to technology, quality of life, assessment of social cohesion and community perceptions and community involvement. According to BRIDGE administrative reports, between November and December of 2010, Community Building staff met with 109 Potrero Terrace-Annex residents. Table 4.4 below illustrates the diverse turnout they had between Terrace and Annex residents and by race, age and gender.

\textsuperscript{25} Community Building and Planning; Community Services/Amenities; Transportation; Gardening and the Environment (more recently referred to as Sustainable Living); Jobs; Youth/Education; New Housing; Disaster Preparedness and Safety.

\textsuperscript{26} Action Teams do not currently meet due to shifts in the Rebuild process.

\textsuperscript{27} The Dream Box was a resident-initiated project that involved residents writing their dreams for their community and dropping it in one of the dream boxes.
Table 4.4. Summary of demographic breakdown of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Get-Together participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrace vs. Annex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace residents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex residents</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 109
Source BRIDGE administrative data
* does not total 109 participants because categories were not mutually exclusive; participants could identify as more than one race
** Shares were not calculated due to double-counting

In terms of quality of life, 40 percent of respondents felt “It has stayed the same” in the last three years because there are still shootings, violence, the same people, the presence of drugs and no activities for youth. About the same split, however, felt “it has improved” and “it has worsened” (29 percent and 30 percent, respectively). For those who said it improved, reported fewer shootings, less violence, reduced crime, the community coming together, buildings being repainted, property being cleaner and individual changes in people’s lives (i.e., clean and sober, bigger apartment, new girlfriend). For those who said it worsened, described more violence, more shootings, the presence of drugs, few jobs, dirty, no activities for youth and no respect.

When residents were asked about various dimensions of social cohesion on a 1-5 ranking system (with 1 being strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree), the averages and median rankings by statement were as follows (table 4.5):
Table 4.5 Summary of residents’ responses to “social cohesion” questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My neighbors are helpful</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I trust my neighbors</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel safe in my neighborhood</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have heard of the &quot;Rebuild Potrero&quot; project</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I participate in Potrero Hill community events, parties and festivals</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am happy with the programs and services at the FRC</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am happy with the programs and services at the Rec Center</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am happy with the programs and services at the NABE</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have pride in my community</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have a healthy lifestyle</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can make a difference in my community</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I visit with friends and family at least two times per week</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 109
Source BRIDGE administrative data

According to Weinstein, the Get-Togethers created an environment of trust; it modeled for the community a new form of community participation, and it also provided Community Building staff the opportunity to build relationships with residents, grow a base of support for future community building activities and identify potential resident leaders (2012).

4.9.5 Unite Potrero Community Get-Togethers

In an attempt to unify the broader Potrero Hill neighborhood, Weinstein conceived of organizing a neighborhood-wide activity—building off of the tree and vegetable-planting event from the prior year, but with an added spin. She created the name “Unite Potrero” to be intentional about uniting the various neighborhoods across the Hill. She also kept the "Get-Together" language, to provide continuity with the Get-Togethers that she had recently completed with Potrero Terrace-Annex residents. The first “Unite Potrero” event took place early 2011 with the purpose to bring together residents from all over Potrero Hill to participate “in a fun, constructive and interactive dialogue about their community” (Weinstein 2012).

Keeping with the resident inclusion and empowerment theme and also to foster cohesion and problem-solving skills between North and South side residents, to ensure the meeting was well organized, publicized, and inclusive and achieved its 150-attendance goal, Community Building staff established a
planning committee to plan the event. The committee met five times and comprised of 20 members, half of whom were residents of Potrero Terrace-Annex and the remaining from the surrounding Hill community and Rebuild Potrero staff. BRIDGE also hired Institute of the Commons, a professional firm that specializes in large-group processes, to help design and facilitate the event.

Meeting facilitators organized the event like a World Café, with 50 small tables, each decorated with colorful tablecloths, miniature flowerpots and cups of candies. Each table was also provided flip-chart paper and colored markers to record participants’ ideas and impressions from the meeting. After meeting participants signed in, utilizing color-coded dots to identify the group they most associated with—i.e., government, community-based organization, business owner, education, arts, young adult, youth or community resident—they were led in a warm-up exercise, writing past community activities and members in Potrero Hill on a Community Timeline. Residents were then led through a “Who’s in the room” welcome exercise and had participants raise their hands if they related to a statement—i.e., likes basketball.

According to an event memorandum, “The event was a huge success, exceeding its attendance goal with more than 175 participants.” Attendees comprised government officials, staff of local community-based organizations and schools, artists, business owners, youth, and community residents from every corner of the hill—including dozens of residents from Potrero Terrace and Annex public housing. By the end of the event, the community identified the trends impacting Potrero Hill, created a cohesive community vision and action agenda (beyond the Transformation Plan and PARADISE Plan) and established the nine Action Teams with identified initiatives and community projects.28
4.10 Community Building Initiative (CBI)

4.10.1 Planning

After the implementation of the resident Get-Togethers and the Unite Potrero Community-Wide Get-Together, Weinstein began thinking about the kinds of regular community building activities to offer in the community. She was convinced that after seeing the inconsistency and low quality of existing programs and services, the community needed something, “consistent,” “visible” in the community, something “not around a plan” and “fun.” When asked how she determined the activities to provide, she responded,

I started with something that I knew would land right. And, health is something that most people know they need to take care of and do. So we started out with a walking club because it’s something you can do where you can talk and walk, so it’s something social. But it also helps people feel better. For a while, it was just me and [the Junior Community Builder] week after week. After residents saw the consistency, they started to join in.

As the walking club grew with more participants, BRIDGE staff added other health-related activities including a Zumba class and gardening programs. Overtime, they created other programs, which will be discussed in the proceeding section, and developed strategies for communications, incentives and meeting/activity logistics.

4.10.2 Communications

BRIDGE utilizes several communications strategies to engage residents in its various community-building activities. Its signature strategy is its calendars, which Weinstein described as [BRIDGE’s] “bond” with residents (2013). At MIT’s 2013 symposium, Weinstein shared how the calendars have been consistently delivered to residents every month for three years; it has maintained the same format and residents can trust that any activity on the calendar will take place. Also, on the back of the calendar is a tracking sheet, which allows residents to plan ahead what they want to do, set goals, choose what to participate in and see their goals each month. Other communications strategies include the Rebuild Potrero
website, which is kept up to date with activities and meetings for the month, staff email blasts or postcards mailings and staff announcements at regular CBG meetings.

4.10.3 Incentives

To encourage resident participation in CBI activities and to stimulate resident's sense of self-efficacy, BRIDGE created an incentive system for TICB participation. At present, for every six stamps a resident receives on its green calendar (which includes gardening work days and the cooking workshop), he/she receives a $50 gift card. For the orange calendar, which includes the Zumba classes and walking club, residents receive a $25 gift card after 12 stamps. When the program initially started, the threshold for incentives was lower at four activities per month. After resident input on the incentive structure, BRIDGE increased the thresholds to what they are presently. Currently, there is no maximum a resident can redeem each year; however, participants must be at least 12 years of age. Also, the system is slightly different for its other program, HGP, which will be discussed in the following section, in that a family receives a $25 gift card for attending four parent-child activities a month. In terms of its effectiveness, according to Weinstein, she accepts that many residents attend activities for the incentives, but also recognizes that there are some who come for the activities and more intrinsic motivations.

More recently, Banh has been thinking of adding a “group incentive” to the existing incentive structure so as to encourage residents to participate for community goals. For example, one idea is to set a goal for the number of miles the walking club needs to complete in order to have a community barbecue. Another idea is to have a block party when the community reaches 1,000 unduplicated participants in CBI activities. Banh believes that switching to this approach can also encourage participants to invite their neighbors, who might not currently be active in CBI activities, to participate. Similar to its previous incentive structure change, where residents were engaged in a transparent restructuring process, Banh plans to involve residents in determining how the group incentive can be structured.

Some people I interviewed feel incentives are controversial. One reason is because having incentives makes it difficult to determine whether people are participating solely for the incentive or because of other intrinsic motivations of wanting to build community with others.
4.10.4 Activity/Meeting supports: Food and translations

Recognizing the importance of providing high-quality activities, BRIDGE ensures that all of its activities and meetings are fun, accessible and worthwhile, in that they provide dinners at various meetings and activities. They also contract Spanish, Cantonese and Mandarin translators to assist with activities and meetings that involve more dialogue. For example, when I participated in the Healthy Living workshop, a handful of Hispanic and Chinese residents were wearing headsets as translators translated the nutrition facilitator's lessons.

4.10.5 Current programming

At present, Rebuild Potrero offers a menu of CBI activities throughout the week and at varying days and times. All CBI activities are free and open to the entire Potrero Hill community. Many activities were conceptualized by the community and have grown incrementally over time through resident demand; sustained participation levels and importantly, stable funding for at least three years. The activities fall under several umbrella program areas described in turn below.

4.10.5.1 Potrero Healthy Living Program

The Potrero Healthy Living Program (HGL) includes a walking club, Zumba class, cooking workshop, meditation class, and sober living support group and is intended to increase awareness among residents about healthy living and to provide tangible opportunities for instituting healthier lifestyles through exercise, nutrition and exposure to nature. The Walking Club includes a 30-40 minute walking route throughout Potrero Terrace-Annex development led by the Junior Community Builder. The Zumba class, which meets at the NABE, involves a one-hour class taught by a professional Zumba instructor.

29 In the beginning of CBI activities, residents helped with translations, however since then, BRIDGE has shifted to contracting professional translators so as to allow residents who volunteered as translators to be active participants.
30 There were also numerous programs that existed for a couple of years, but are no longer being offered. Those include: Young Men's Program, SF Safe and SAFE Leadership, HOPE SF Leadership Academy (for adults and for youth); RAMP and Financial Empowerment Program. While many of these programs were not BRIDGE-initiated, BRIDGE temporarily housed the programs or made many resident referrals to them.
Cooking workshops are offered monthly based on a one-year curriculum developed and taught by a Registered Dietician. Workshops include educational lessons and hands-on food preparation, expert speakers, pre- and post-assessments. Meditation classes meet twice a week for one hour to go through meditation exercises. The Sober living support group meets once a week and provides peer support to residents. Both the meditation and sober living support group were initiated and are led by Potrero Terrace-Annex residents and take place in a renovated public housing unit.

4.10.5.2 Potrero Garden Program

Conceived by the Potrero Sustainable Living Group (formerly the Potrero Garden Action Team), the Potrero Garden Program presently involves a Barrel Garden Program and two community gardens—one at Texas Street and another at the FRC. Collectively, the three gardening programs are intended to bring residents around positive experiences around health.

The FRC Garden was the first program successfully rolled out by the Potrero Sustainable Living Group and includes a small community garden with four raised beds located behind the FRC. The “incubator” space provided residents the opportunity to experience gardening and to increase the opportunity for residents to eat fresh produce. Surrounding community members and residents of Potrero Terrace-Annex maintain the FRC Garden on a regular basis. Monthly workdays are scheduled on the second Monday of each month to encourage resident involvement and provide an opportunity for the community to participate in a positive shared experience.

The Texas Street Garden includes a one-third acre garden that provides a space to grow and harvest fresh produce as well as provide a calm, safe lookout point for residents. The construction of the garden brought short-term employment opportunities and enabled more residents to learn about gardening. A Garden Manager and three garden apprentices (all public housing residents) were hired to maintain the gardens.31

31 Garden apprentices have since reduced to two apprentices.
The Barrel Garden program provides residents the opportunity to garden at their doorstep. Using wood and plastic barrels, residents receive, in exchange for a small donation and maintenance agreement, a self-contained garden and plant start, and an individualized educational session with a professional landscaper. Additionally, a team of residents serves as the “Maintenance Crew” providing ongoing assistance and ensuring the longevity and growth of the program throughout the housing development.

4.10.5.3 Rebuild Potrero Community Building Group

As mentioned above, when BRIDGE staff engaged in its community process between 2008 and 2010, they engaged over 1,000 residents and community members. After the BRIDGE team submitted its Master Plan proposal to the City, the “most committed residents formed the Community Building Group” (Weinstein 2012, 6). CBG was made up of 30 people—half representing the North side and the other half the South side (which also includes Potrero Terrace-Annex residents). The purpose of CBG was to meet each month to hear updates about Rebuild Potrero and other neighborhood projects, to plan future community building events, and to provide a “social space for continued interaction between members of all sides of the Hill” (Weinstein 2012, 7). CBG meetings are open to the broader Hill community. The Senior Community Builder, with support from the Junior Community Builder, oversees and leads most of the meetings and monitors how the meetings should be organized.

4.10.5.4 Unite Potrero Community-Wide Events

Unite Potrero Community-wide events take place at least once, and on occasion several times, a year and are intended to bring the diverse communities of Potrero together for a shared community project, while also fostering social cohesion. Since 2011, activities have included festivals and outdoor movies, a community walk and the painting of a community mural. The community walk and mural are discussed in greater detail in the next section.

4.10.5.5 Healthy Generations Project (HGP)

Launched as a pilot in 2013, HGP is a new parent-child community-based health program that helps families reduce the health impacts of toxic stress on young children. It was created in partnership with a
UCSF child psychiatrist, an environmental law and justice attorney and Weinstein, who were eager to improve the cognitive and emotional resiliency of children between 0-5 years old. The curriculum is grounded on five protective factors: (1) Provide healthy nutrition, (2) Stimulate brain activity, (3) Ensure toxic-free environments, (4) Create positive community and home interactions, and (5) Put education first. Together, these factors collectively, aim to increase children’s readiness for kindergarten, academic proficiency, school attendance and other long-term health benefits for children. On a yearly basis, HGP staff carry out a combination of teaching and modeling activities to parents and children as well as a public awareness campaign to highlight its work and involve the broader community.32

HGP includes a peer-to-peer program for parents and children between 0-5 involving workshops and activities like reading groups, playgroups and Family Laid Back Nights (FLBNs), a daily walking school bus (WSB), a series of field trips and an annual public awareness campaign. The HGP director, eight Community Health Leaders (CHLs) and volunteers lead the various activities. The WSB as well as the reading group were first launched in September of 2013 for the 2013-2014 School Year (SY); meanwhile the playgroups started November 2013 and FLBNs started the last week of August 2014. Since HGP has been launched, BRIDGE has added two to three new CHLs each year.

The WSB includes two daily walking routes—one to Daniel Webster and the other to Starr King Elementary—led by CHLs every school morning. The WSB follows a specific route and stops to pick up children to make sure they have a safe walk from home to both of the schools. Once a month, children are provided with incentives to stay focused in school and to continue to participate with the WSB to get to school on time, to attend school everyday and to eat a healthy school breakfast. The incentives include school supplies, backpacks or fun books to read and study materials.

Among the parent-child activities, reading groups have been the most popular. Each of the activities begins with a mediation period for children and their parents and then parents and children share in a

32 The HGP website provides greater detail on the program and some of its achievements http://www.healthygenerationsproject.org/, including a short video produced by BAYCAT, a San Francisco-based nonprofit that educates, empowers and employs underserved youth and young adults in digital media, which highlights some of its success thus far http://www.healthygenerationsproject.org/#/media-donate/clir4.
healthy meal among one another and their neighbors. Dinners are prepared by and the tables are fully set up with tablecloths to provide a home feeling. This fun activity is joined by our partners Leah’s Pantry, who has hired six residents from the community to learn catering and cooking and prepare our FLBNs.

After dinner CHLs present the families with a play activity, such as art projects, storytelling and music, or the families read stories together. For FLBNs, families go into a quiet room where soft music is playing and take five-to-ten minutes to enjoy deep breathing and relaxation time led by one of the HGP CHLs. Children are taught how to sit or lie quietly and focus on their breathing; parents are encouraged to use deep breathing and relaxation techniques at home. All activities end with a good night song and special story. And, before children leave the CHLs go around the room and say a loving good night to parents and children and remind them that it is bedtime. The adventure trips involve taking families out of the neighborhood to experience cultural activities throughout San Francisco.

Each year, HGP organizes a series of eight workshops to introduce HGP’s core concepts, focusing on the effects of trauma and stress on young children, particularly those under five years of age. The workshop is a fun, interactive experience open to all residents of Potrero Terrace-Annex. Participants learn about how Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) can predict cognitive, emotional and even health problems in childhood and well into adulthood. In particular, they explain the five protective factors that build resilience in children and how HGP’s model works to create change in the community. 33

Finally, in the fall of each year, HGP launches a public awareness campaign to highlight a theme of its work and to incorporate HGP into the broader community. Its aim is to create a more “Child-Friendly Zone” community-wide. The 2015 theme was school attendance and in order to help everyone feel connected with the importance of getting children to school every day, HGP created the “I have choices, I choose to go to school” message on T-shirts and distributed them widely in the neighborhood. Table 4.6 charts our the activities in a given week

33 The workshops are also a prerequisite for any community member who applies for a CHL position. Participants are given a stipend if they attend seven of the eight workshops. CHL candidates must complete a written exam testing their knowledge of the 5 Protective Factors and how they help to protect children exposed to Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs).
Table 4.6 Rebuild Potrero community building activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>club (PH)</td>
<td>Living</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>class***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workday</td>
<td></td>
<td>cooking</td>
<td>workday</td>
<td>(FRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>workshop</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>club*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workday</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>class (PTA)</td>
<td>class (PTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zumba</td>
<td>HGP play</td>
<td>Zumba (N)</td>
<td>HGP FLBN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>group (PTA)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(PTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**
* every other month
** once a month
*** twice a month
(N) located at the NABE
(G) located at one of the two community gardens
(PH) Potrero Hill
(PTA) Potrero Terrace-Annex
(FRC) Family Resource Center

---

34 Except the first Monday of each month, when it meets at 10:30am
4.10.6 Incremental growth

Aligning with the TICB model, BRIDGE staff grew each of the activities incrementally based on consistent participation levels and three years of sustained funding. The following are a list of activities, their initial frequencies and their increased (and current) frequencies.35

- Walking club started out once a week January 2011, increased to twice a week January 2012 and then increased again to three times a week January 2013.
- Garden workdays started out once a week March 2011 and increased to twice a week by February 2013.
- Zumba started out once a week February 2012 and increased to twice a week February 2013.
- Meditation started out once a week March 2012 and then increased to twice a week February 2013.

4.10.7 Additional strategies

There are also additional strategies that undergird the TICB model that are less about “activities” and more about the organizational “process.” First, BRIDGE created an on-site office (in the existing SFHA property management office), where activities are held and where residents can meet with BRIDGE staff. This conscious decision also allows BRIDGE to have a consistent, physical presence and to embed itself in the community. Second, as of 2014, BRIDGE utilizes Peer Health Leaders (PHL), a program instituted by the TSFF, to implement HGP. At Potrero Terrace-Annex, PHLs are referred to as CHLs and

35 All of the information about activity frequency increases/decreases were provided by Community Builder staff in an administrative document.
they focus primarily on parenting support and providing (and modeling) for parents and children under five years old positive, bonding experiences; and its goal is to reduce stress and address trauma.\textsuperscript{36}

4.10.8 Tracking

BRIDGE has done some tracking of its CBI activities, however it is not consistently being captured at the same level, frequency and timeframes. Staff note that while they are trying to track a lot of information about residents’ participation and link to their demographic data and other administrative data; there are lots of sensitivities all around it. Also, part of the community building vibe is that it is open and just about bringing people together; that it is not about tracking. As Weinstein shared, “So you want to maintain that kind of feeling, but also want to provide structure to track participation.”

\textsuperscript{36}As of this writing, PHLs do not have similar functions across all four HOPE SF sites; though this is something HOPE SF hopes to streamline in the coming years.
Analysis of TICB’s impacts at Potrero Terrace-Annex

In this section, I evaluate the impacts of individual TICB activities at Potrero Terrace-Annex. To do so, for the first part of my analysis, I use BRIDGE’s participation data and anecdotal evidence from my interviews to answer my three research questions regarding increasing social interactions between North and South side residents, increasing public housing residents’ civic engagement and capacity and transforming democratic processes and the public education system. Next, I highlight a few exemplary activities that have had significant positive impacts in one or many of the outcome areas. Finally, I conclude with an assessment of how the TICB framework aligns against two evidence-based models—one for trauma-informed service delivery (The Full Frame Initiative) and one for community building (Resident Centered Community Building).

5.1 Early impacts of the TICB work in Potrero Hill

In this first part, I return to my three research questions and summarize some of my major findings from the Potrero Terrace-Annex case. Through a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses, I present some preliminary findings about the impacts of BRIDGE’s community building activities. Specifically, I discuss participation levels and patterns among Potrero Terrace-Annex residents and community stakeholders and support (or complicate) those findings with anecdotal evidence. As discussed in the introduction, I have three primary sources of data to derive my findings: (1) BRIDGE administrative data, (2) interview data with 20 key informants, and (3) field notes from participant observations at two community building activities. I also draw upon secondary data from reports and documentaries that have recently been completed on Potrero’s CBI activities.

BRIDGE administrative data comprise three datasets tracking participation across all of its activities. The time period (i.e., 2011-2013 or August 2013-October 2014), frequency of reporting (i.e., monthly, annual) and level of analysis (i.e., individual-, activity- or monthly-level) vary across each of the datasets; therefore, it is important to note that my findings do not represent the same timeframe. For example,
gardening class participation is tracked at the individual level from August 2013 to October 2014; however, Zumba participation is tracked at the class-level and does not account for individual-level participation each month between August 2013 and October 2014. For these reasons, I indicate the time period and level of analysis for each of my findings.

Interview data comprise 20 interviews I conducted with community stakeholders, who have been involved with TICB in some capacity, whether as implementers, consumers or observers. I did not, however, speak with Potrero Terrace-Annex residents as many were engaged in another study by San Francisco State University taking place simultaneous to this research. As such, one should consider these two research efforts as complementary to one another. SFSU’s study focuses on a sample of residents’ perspectives on the TICB model; while this research focuses on the broader community’s perspectives on the TICB model.37

Field notes are from my participant observations at two CBI activities: the Healthy Living cooking workshop and the walking club. Both took place early 2015 during one of my two site visits to Potrero Hill.

Because of these obvious significant limitations it is important to note that the findings in this section are a snapshot of a small and biased set of perspectives. Also, because the quantitative data are not longitudinal or tracked at the individual level, or joined with other demographic data, one cannot determine if participation levels have increased, decreased or sustained over time or if there are new participants, lost participants. From 2011 to early 2015, the community building team senses that participation numbers seem to have fallen due to the prolonged lead-time to reconstruction. It is also not clear who is participating (or put another way, who the program is targeting or not reaching)—in terms of demographic, socioeconomic and housing tenure characteristics.

37 Should additional resources be available in the future, one idea is to combine data from both research efforts.
I conclude this section with a set of mini case studies of several of the exemplary community building activities that were frequently mentioned in my stakeholder interviews. In addition to providing greater detail about each activity, I describe how they contribute to my three research questions.

5.1.1 Participation across all community building activities

Because of how data is currently being tracked for all of CBI activities, I am only able to report:

1. The number of unique participants each month and
2. The total attendance for each activity for any given month between July 2013 and October 2014.38

In the two subsequent tables (tables 5.1 and 5.2), one can see the extent of participation in the various community-building activities, from month-to-month for the period July 2014 to October 2014. It is clear Zumba trumps all the other activities (even those like the walking club that meets three days a week and the meditation classes that meet for the same number of days in a week).

Table 5.1. Participation by activity, by month (July 2013-October 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zumba</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Club</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Living Workshop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Group</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Workdays</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 341
Source: BRIDGE administrative data, November 2014

Table 5.2. Participation by number of times participated, by month (July 2013-October 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 and more</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 341
Source: BRIDGE administrative data, November 2014

38 The latter accounts for duplicate participants because attendance is not tracked at the individual-level. Rather attendance is simply totaled for each activity, not delineating by individual.
During the 16-month period between July 2013 and October 2014, 341 community stakeholders from across Potrero Terrace-Annex and the surrounding community participated to some extent in community building activities. Participation levels ranged from as few as one instance in a 16-month period to as many as 267 instances over the same period. A typical stakeholder participated in a total average of 37 activities (over 2.3 activities per month) or a median of 15 activities (close to one activity per month). For any given month, the average participant engaged in an average (and median) of six activities (or one in every five days). Figure 5.1 below illustrates the distribution of participation levels across all participants.

Of the 341 participants, there is a relatively even split between Potrero Terrace-Annex residents (49.9 percent) and community stakeholders (49.6 percent). According to Banh, surrounding community stakeholders' high participation levels in Zumba and community-wide events are likely driving the nearly 50/50 split. Table 5.3 below illustrates participation patterns of all stakeholders, Potrero Terrace-Annex residents and surrounding community residents over the 16-month data reporting timeframe.

---

39 These include Zumba, walking club, meditation, Healthy Living workshop, sober living support group and the three garden workshop days.
40 Two participants (or 0.6%) were not categorized as a "resident" or "community stakeholder" in the dataset I was provided.
Table 5.3. Participation by stakeholder type (July 2013-October 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From Jul 2013 – Oct 2014</th>
<th>Per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potrero Terrace-Annex residents</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding community residents</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data includes HLP activities as well as CBG meetings, gardening activities and communitywide events
Source: BRIDGE administrative data, November 2014.

Potrero Terrace-Annex residents had higher average and median participation levels over the same 14-month period compared to the full sample. Potrero Terrace-Annex residents averaged 50 activities (3.6 activities per month) and a median of 26 activities (close to two activities per month). Also, the average Potrero Terrace-Annex resident engaged in a slightly higher average of activities on any given month (8 vs. 6 activities). Figure 5.2 below illustrates the distribution of participation levels among the 170 Potrero Terrace-Annex residents.

On the other hand, surrounding community residents had lower average and median participation levels over the same 16-month period compared to the full sample. Residents participated in an average of 20 activities (1.4 activities per month) or a median of 11 activities. Also, the average participant engaged in
fewer activities on average compared to the 341 sample and Potrero Terrace-Annex residents (4 vs. 6.2 and 8, respectively). Figure 5.3 below illustrates the distribution of participation levels among the 169 community stakeholders.

According to stakeholder interviews, when the walking club was initially launched, there was some involvement from the North side community. In one of BAYCAT’s documentaries, a community stakeholder shared her motivation for participating in BRIDGE’s community building activities as such:

I have been coming to the walking club. It’s not so much because of the exercise; that’s sort of the excuse, it’s really for the community building. It’s about walking with neighbors, hearing their stories, becoming comfortable and familiar and developing relationships over time, which takes a while to build trust, so if you’re seeing the same people over and over, you develop familiarity and over time you build trust. – Potrero Community Member.

However over time, North side participation in the walking club—and other CBI activities—has dwindled. For a few stakeholders, whom I spoke with, it was because they moved out of Potrero Hill; and for a couple of others, it was because they got busy with other things like work.
5.1.2 Participation among gardening programs only

Unlike the data reported above, BRIDGE collects more detailed participation data for its gardening programs, including by individual, by activity and by month. In terms of the garden barrel program, between 2011 and 2013, 30 barrels were installed at the homes of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents (table 5.4). While no barrels were installed during the 2014 period, BRIDGE expects to install a dozen barrels in 2015, which will bring participation levels to 45 households (out of 606 total households) (Interview with Banh).

Table 5.4. Participation in the garden barrel program (2011-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of barrels installed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected

Source: BRIDGE administrative data, November 2014

In regards to the Texas Street and FRC gardening classes, 120 residents and community stakeholders participated in classes from August 2013 to October 2014. About 91 percent of participants were Potrero Terrace-Annex residents; the remaining nine percent were stakeholders from the surrounding community. Over the 15-month period, participation levels among all participants varied significantly. Of the 105 participants for which there is monthly participation data available, one-third only participated 1-6 times in 15 months; on the other end, close to one-quarter participated in over 61 classes. Figure 5.4 below illustrates the distribution. Participants averaged 31 (or a median of 18) total gardening classes over the 15 month-period. For any given month, a typical participant joined in an average of five gardening classes (or a median of six classes).

---

41 Monthly participation data are not available for 15 participants.
Overall, the gardening activities have not only increased residents' appreciation and understanding of healthy food options and gardening skills, but it has served as a community building space, where residents and outside community members can regularly interact with one another, learn from one another and work together on maintaining the gardens. With three gardening classes per week, residents have had close to 180 opportunities to come together. However, based on the empirical analyses, it seems interactions are mostly occurring among residents of public housing and less so among residents of the broader Hill. One promising finding is the fact that the community gardens and barrels have not been damaged, littered or had anything stolen. This represents a level of social control and respect among community stakeholders for communal spaces that the community has created, maintains and utilizes.

In terms of supporting interactions across the North and South sides, it does not seem the gardening activities have been too promising. For example, among the five surrounding community stakeholders

42 15 months x 12 classes a month (3 classes per week) = 180 classes over a 15-month period.
who participated in gardening classes over the 15-month period, only one participant participated regularly. In fact, she exceeded the average of 31, having participated in 47 gardening classes. The remaining four has only participated in one class. These statistics confirm some of the stories I heard in the field—including that Potrero Terrace-Annex residents dominate most community building activities (with the exception of Zumba); how surrounding community stakeholders are less likely to participate in activities that take place within the public housing development and how only a select few non-public housing residents actively participate in CBI activities. This illustrates how spatial decisions of where activities are offered can impact opportunities for interaction. Figure 5.5 illustrates the location of the two community gardens relative to the North and South sides.

Figure 5.5 Potrero Terrace-Annex’s community gardens
Source Bing Maps
5.1.3 Participation in CBG and community-wide meetings

While BRIDGE staff do not have an updated list of all active participants in CBG and Unite Potrero events from both Potrero Terrace-Annex and residents outside, it does have a mailing list with 1,000 unduplicated residents. It obtained each person’s contact information from his/her signing in to a community event. This list was started late 2010, with some contacts from the work that commenced in 2008.

5.1.4 Participation in HGP activities

During SY 2013-2014, 33 children participated regularly or semi-regularly in the walking school bus. More about this activity is presented in the following section. In terms of the parent-child activities, between September 2013 and November 2014, as many as 16 parents to as few as nine parents participated in reading groups. The average and median each month were both 13 parents. For most months, there was a one-to-one parent-to-child ratio, as the median and average number of children that participated each month was 15 children.\(^{43}\) In terms of playgroups, between November 2013 and November 2014, as many as 15 parents to as few as seven parents participated. The average and median number of parents who participated each month was 11 and 12, respectively. For most months, there was a one-to-one parent-to-child ratio, as the median and average number of children that participated each month was 12 and 13, respectively.\(^{44}\) Over the three-month period (August 2014 and November 2014), as many as 15 parents to as few as four parents participated in FLBN. The average and median number of parents that participated each month was 9 and 8, respectively.\(^{45}\) Finally, seventeen adults participated in the March 2014 workshops.

Of all the parents and children who participate in HGP activities, all are Potrero Terrace-Annex residents; none are from the surrounding Hill community. However, the HGP activities have had other spillover effects. For example, according to the HGP Director, about eight to 10 elementary school-age children

\(^{43}\) Missing children participation data for September 2014 – November 2014  
\(^{44}\) Missing children participation data for September 2014 – November 2014  
\(^{45}\) The dataset did not contain children’s participation levels for the same period.
who participate in the walking school bus have been showing up regularly at parent-child activities. Even though they are technically over the age for parent-child activities and not accompanied by a parent/guardian, the HGP Director lets them partake of dinner and help with setting up and cleaning up after activities and with reading to the children. The HGP Director recognizes the importance of nurturing these children who need a parent’s attention and to be surrounded by positive activities. In fact, she is thinking about creating a volunteer program where the children can be Junior CHLs. She sees this as an opportunity to model community building and peer-to-peer mentoring among children at young ages; rather than trying to build—or rebuild—relationships when children are older or are adults.

Overall, HGP activities have not only modeled positive and healthy parent-child activities, but it has served as a community building space, where residents and outside community members can regularly interact with one another, learn from one another and work together on maintaining the gardens. With the three parent-child activities each week, families have about 150 opportunities to get together to share in a meal and spend time with their children.

While the HGP activities have been effective in targeting the families of need—those with children not enrolled in formal childcare—it has not been effective in bridging the social interactions among North and South side families, beyond the WSB. A few telling findings, however, are that parents are building relationships with others parents in the development; children are forming bonds with other children at a young age and CHLs (and those who complete the HGP annual workshops) are increasing their capacity in child development. This could be a pathway to career opportunities. Also, there is a South side couple that has provided tremendous energy and resources to HGP. For example, the husband regularly volunteers to lead the WSB; the couple brought its church to help with HGP’s Christmas party by wrapping gifts and singing carols to the families. The couple is also currently working on two projects—one to raise awareness about HGP and another to improve the education system more broadly, as the wife works in the education system.

“I think it’s important to have community because if we don’t have community, how will we build friendships around community? How are we going to grow up not knowing who we live with? How can we build friendships to grow and watch over each other?”

- HGP parent
Finally, HGP has tremendous promise to transform systems. For example, in addition to increasing the capacity of CHLs and workshop participants, HGP can also be raising awareness about the need for more formal (and affordable) childcare in the neighborhood. It can also shed light on a new approach to serving children and parents in high-poverty communities.

In my interview with Banh, I learned that some of the challenges with trying to scale the HGP program as a whole up are numerous capacity issues. In particular, their current physical space (a converted public housing unit) is not sufficient to support more families than it currently serves. Additionally, the current budget that it has can only support seven CHLs and the current activities that it offers. More funding would be needed to support future hiring, greater reach and more activities.

5.1.5 Spillover effects of community building activities

There have been significant spillover effects resulting from community building activities. One of the most compelling, and more importantly, “authentic” demonstrations of social capital is when residents from Potrero Terrace-Annex and the broader community came together for a Thanksgiving community dinner on Dakota Street in 2014. The idea was conceptualized by a couple of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents during their family barbecue and then shared with the broader community on Potrero Hill’s Next Door website, where Potrero Terrace-Annex residents shared information about the event and asked for various food donations from surrounding community members. According to the Junior Community Builder, surrounding community residents responded by bringing food donations, but also staying to help serve the food and enjoy one another’s company. Over 100 people from across the Hill attended the dinner and among them were SFHA staff (and their families) and local law enforcement. The Junior Community Builder described how residents designated the area where the dinner was taking place as a “stress-free drama zoning” and everyone respected the space—in that there was no fighting, drinking, smoking or childrearing in that designated area. This dinner not only exemplified “authentic” cohesion, but also and the community’s ability to self-organize, establish ground rules for its

46 Next Door is a private social network website that residents can create for their respective neighborhoods.
event and to rely on one another for support. Also, as the Junior Community Builder put it, “People felt comfortable to come on the block [Dakota Street] and that’s a success.”

Another spillover example is when a South side resident invited residents from all across Potrero Hill to her home for her annual clothing swap. As the Junior Community Builder described, “She’s been doing this for years now, and this year has involved public housing residents...Six years ago, I never would have been at her house; I would have never known her.” The same South side resident also held a Dream Box party, where—again—residents from both the North and South sides gathered at her house for an evening of potluck food and crafting. In a blog post she wrote,


> Apart from my Sierra Heights neighbors, I didn’t know any of these people before our community-building group started a little over a year ago. Now I see many of them when I walk around the neighborhood, and I enjoy stopping to talk to these neighbors. We have further chances for interactions at our meetings. But spending time together in a more relaxed setting gave me a chance to get to know people a little better. We have some fun, interesting neighbors! It was great to gather in a setting that was more of a party than a meeting, and yet we got a lot done. I look forward to future gatherings with neighbors.

A third set of spillover examples relates to the idea of resource sharing. One South side resident described how he regularly drives a Potrero Terrace-Annex family home after CBG meetings. He also provided his contact information to them to be a resource. The same resident also hosted an event at his house, in which he invited several public housing residents to discuss a project he and his wife are working on around reforming public education. In addition to residents sharing their thoughts on the topic, he described how they also all had the opportunity to share their stories. As one of the hosts shared, “People were opening up...having raw discussions about what their lives were like.” While the hosts knew some of the guests from public housing, there were a few they met for the first time that night: “I know we established a connection and the next time we see each other we will know, ‘I already know your story and they know mines,” described the resident.

Finally, the last set of unplanned benefits revolves around residents banding together for public awareness. In late 2010, the Potrero Hill Archive Project—a longstanding project in the community—
sponsored a history night where three residents from Potrero Terrace-Annex—men who call themselves “The Unique Ones”—had the opportunity to share their experiences growing up in public housing in the 1950s and 1960s. Prior to the Rebuild, not much had been documented or shared regarding the history of Potrero Terrace-Annex and this provided a space to do so. Also, this was Potrero Hill Archive Project’s first project on Potrero Terrace-Annex. Similarly, during my interviews, I learned of two other resident-initiated projects in support of raising awareness about the history of Potrero Terrace-Annex and families that will be impacted by the Rebuild. Both projects are currently underway. A North side resident is organizing the historic documentary; while a South side resident is applying for grant funds for a storytelling project for families. Together, these three examples represent how residents outside of public housing are initiating projects to support Terrace-Annex residents.

5.2. Exemplary activities

Among the many CBI activities and events that have been organized, several have been more successful in building community than others. In this section, I discuss what I am referring to as “exemplary” activities, provide greater detail as to what each activity is, how it is implemented and the impacts it is having across various community-building goals and at varying scales of the ecological framework. I conclude with a set of challenges and considerations for each of the activities.

5.2.1 Exemplary activity 1: Healthy Generations Project walking school bus

The walking school bus is one activity under HGP, which had resounding consensus among stakeholders regarding its impact on the children and families living in Potrero Terrace-Annex, the staff that lead the walking school bus, members in the broader Potrero Hill community and on systems. It is led by three CHLs per “bus”, who pick children up at each of the “bus stops” during the weekdays. One school bus takes children to Daniel Webster Elementary with seven stops along the way and another to Starr King Elementary with five along the way. The routes are less than 0.5 miles long. To encourage children’s regular participation on the WSB and the importance of school, each month, children are given incentives such as books, backpacks and school supplies as rewards.
In terms of impacts, since the walking school bus started, children going to Daniel Webster and Starr King elementary schools have experienced improved attendance rates—both in terms of arriving on time and attending each day; they have been able to eat school breakfast regularly; and they are able to enjoy the company of their friends and other kids. According to HGP Director, prior to the walking school bus, some children got dropped off by their parents or would walk to school alone or with other children. In both cases, some children would either get to school late or not at all. Additionally, some children grabbed chips at a corner store for breakfast. She says now, children get to school on time and have a healthy breakfast.
According to a 2014 Mirant Settlement Progress Report, the WSB takes an average of 15 kids to school each day. However, according to BRIDGE administrative records, during the 2013-2014 school year (SY), 33 children participated in the WSB. Of the 33 children who take the WSB, ridership has varied from as few as five trips in the SY to as many as 152 trips (which is about seven months of the SY). The average was about 78 rides, which is pretty similar to the median of 69 rides (figure 5.7).

Distribution of children's ridership (SY '13-14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of rides</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-120</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 33
Source: BRIDGE administrative data, May 2014

More than half of the children who participate on the WSB attend Daniel Webster (57.6 percent) while 21 percent attend Starr King. School data was missing for a portion of the data I was provided, though it is possible HGP staff know which school each of the children attend (figure 5.8).

47 The San Francisco BOS passed Ordinance No. 217-11, approved by Mayor Edwin Lee November 9, 2011, appropriating $1,000,000 of Mirant Potrero LLC Settlement Funds to the Department of Public Health (DPH) for neighborhood improvement and mitigation in the neighborhoods most impacted by the Potrero Power Plan, initiated in the FY 11-12 budget (SFDPH).
48 The remaining 21% of children did not have schools associated in the data files I was provided.
When the WSB commenced in September 2013, 15 children rode the "bus." By the end of the SY (May 2014), ridership rose to 24 children (figure 5.9). Some reasons ridership were not sustained with each child who started with the bus include: parents thinking missing school is not that important; parents taking children to school on their way to work, children splitting their time with parents/guardians, or more recently, children being taken away by Child Protection Services (CPS) (Interview with HGP Director).
From the time a child first joined the school bus, 21 remained engaged through the end of the SY.\textsuperscript{49} When asked if the program is reaching the children of most need—in terms of having truancy problems—HGP Director responded yes based on conversations she has had with the elementary school staff.

5.2.1.1 WSB and trauma

While the WSB is largely about addressing truancy issues, it also has significant implications with regards to how children experience, process and cope with trauma. In a community like Potrero Terrace-Annex, where violence, fear and chaos are commonplace, having CHLs as resources to children every morning on their journeys to school allows children to have the necessary emotional support and physical protection they might need in the event of a traumatic experience. For example, the HGP Director recalled two stories when the children on the WSB were faced with traumatic events—once when children walked by a house that had recently burned down and another during a police car chase. Not only did CHLs keep the children safe during both events, they gave the children the comfort and support they needed to process their feelings, answers to their questions and assurance that everything would be okay. The HGP Director also described how children are exposed to very stressful experiences at home, so having CHLs to talk to each morning provides another level of support that might not otherwise been available to them elsewhere. Thirdly, the HGP Director described how the experience of children walking “together” and in “their” community helps children establish a sense of bonding and community ownership at young ages—something she shared is easier to do as children as compared to trying to “build” or “restore” bonds later as adults.

\textsuperscript{49} I determined this by examining if a child had some level of participation each month—whether three days a month or 20 days a month. I also only counted those students who have participated for least two months after the start date and before the end of the school year. For example, one student rode the WSB 20 times in May, but I did not include him in the count because he did not meet my previously mentioned criteria.
5.2.1.2 Social cohesion

In addition to building cohesion among the children on the “buses,” WSB builds intergenerational cohesion between the children and the parents and CHLs “driving” the “buses.” During SY 13’-14’, WSB provided about 200 opportunities for these regular interactions,\(^{50}\) illustrating the TICB strategies of having multiple touches and providing many creative opportunities to build social cohesion. A North side resident shared how WSB provides a “visible change that the community is changing for the better” and a “sense of unity” among the broader Potrero Hill community. Evidence of the WSB’s significance and visibility in the community is the recently painted community mural, which features the WSB as a prominent piece of the community. Also, there have also been rumors that children from the North side join the WSB at stops close to their homes. While I was unable to confirm this, I did speak with a North side resident, which mentioned that his child asked to join the walking school bus so he could walk with all his friends to school.

The WSB also provides opportunities for South side residents to meet Potrero Terrace-Annex residents. For example, a resident I interviewed who lives in the townhomes across the street from Potrero Terrace-Annex and volunteers to lead the “bus,” described how he got involved with HGP because wanted to meet families in public housing. And, the WSB allows him to do so. There have also been benefits with peer-to-peer mentoring and relationship building. As Banh describes,

> An unplanned benefit of HGP is helping provide mentoring between the Community Health Leaders and the children that they serve. The children love them and adore them and they just feel so supported, cared for and looked after. They don’t always get that in other parts of their lives. HGP indirectly provided this mentoring to the children (BAYCAT 2014).

And with relationship building, a CHL shared how there are more parents who are now—or more—out in the community with their children and socializing with other children and parents.

\(^{50}\) This was calculated based off of 9 months x 22 school days per month. There are certainly holidays and school vacation days that will reduce this number by 20+ days or so.
I’ve seen they’ve [HGP parents] opened up. We have activities for the kids, but it seems like the parents are getting a lot of it too. Finally, they’re talking to other parents or just communicating about the kids. I see socializing and opening up a little bit, guards coming down (BAYCAT HGP video).

5.2.1.2 Civic capacity

The walking school bus—and HGP overall—has also helped increase the community’s capacity. Because CHLs go through a competitive hiring process, which involves the completion of an eight-week workshop, a passing score on an exam, and a personal interview in addition to a 16-week training and on-the-job training when hired, CHLs have increased their subject knowledge in child development, interpersonal and technical skills and leadership. Described by one CHL, “It [Working for HGP] teaches me even with my child to do it that way. We’re supposed to be teaching them but I’m learning as well from it” (BAYCAT HGP video). Since its inception, 2-3 CHLs have been hired each year, totaling about seven current CHLs.

5.2.1.3 Civic engagement

WSB is also transforming how city agencies and consultants engage residents in planning processes. For example, when the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) was awarded grant funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to lead the Potrero Neighborhood Transportation Project (NTP), consultants used the walking school bus as a platform for engaging the community in the planning process. Transportation and design consultants joined the walking school bus on several occasions to experience first-hand where pedestrian improvements were critical to make the children’s paths safer. They also joined the Healthy Living walking club, where again, they experienced first-hand areas for improvement and spoke with participants about their perceptions about pedestrian safety in their community. As one Community Builder shared, “So those participants in the walking club are now participating in the pedestrian improvement project, as part of the larger redevelopment project.”
The transportation team also utilized the Community Building Group meetings to present and listen to the community’s feedback on its preliminary designs. The meeting was also paired with a site walk to several of the targeted intersections, including stops at the two newly constructed on-site community gardens. When asked about how the experience was working with development staff, one of the consultants described how there was “a clear point of contact at BRIDGE” and they were “a great group of people to work with” in that they provided guidance on “how to work with the community.”

As Weinstein described it, “this new approach to civic engagement is authentic...it is meeting people where they are and engaging them [the “drivers,” parents and children on the walking school bus; the participants in the walking club and the gardeners who maintain the community gardens] in transportation conversations as they normally experience their surroundings.” And while “authentic engagement” alone is a significant impact, the fact that the five priority intersections in the Potrero Terrace and Annex site were “[s]elected, in part, because they lie on the walking school bus routes to Daniel Webster and Starr King Elementary Schools” and “to make the walking school bus safer,” is another tremendous gain.51

Figure 5.10 Screenshot of the NTP, including the five priority intersections
Source Potrero Hill Neighborhood Transportation Plan, November 2014

51 See transportation improvement renderings and plans at the City’s website: http://www.sfcta.org/potrero-hill-neighborhood-transportation-plan-intersection-improvements.
5.2.1.4 Systems change

Extending beyond the outcomes above, WBS is also transforming systems. One system is the education system. Another system, which was already discussed above, is the democratic process planners and consultants traditionally use to engage stakeholders in planning processes.

When staff at the two elementary schools and PTA learned of the walking school bus, they used it as an opportunity to meet families in public housing, who had not been connected (or as connected as they would have hoped in PTA activities). North side parents, for instance, joined the walking school bus to meet the staff running the program and to get to know Potrero Terrace-Annex families. Some knocked on doors to introduce themselves to parents and to share information about resources and upcoming activities at the school. Additionally, according to one Community Builder, the vice principal of one of the schools tries to participate in the walking school bus and the other HGP activities to build relationships and engage parents. Described by one Community Builder, “Making that connection...it’s not why we started the walking school bus, but that’s how systems-change starts to happen and where you see authentic interactions.”

This example—and the transportation planning example described earlier—illustrates how existing community building activities can be leveraged to impact how residents engage with systems and civic issues. And these can ultimately be more effective approaches because they are less cumbersome (consultants do not have to create new meetings; and residents do not have to attend “another meeting”) and they are more authentic (in that consultants are engaging residents in their everyday routines).

Finally, the walking school bus—and again, HGP as a whole—has provided staff with intrinsic benefits. Staff shared how leading the HGP activities and working with families provides personal gratification—“working with the children and watching them enjoy the activities gives me joy”. Another CHL described how many children in the community grow up fatherless, so he likes to provide the fatherly image to the kids and is his way of giving back to the community.
5.2.1.6 Challenges

One of the major challenges with this work is sustained funding. Because this activity, and the HGP project as a whole—is a pilot project and funded through time-limited grants, it risks being cut if additional rounds of funding or new grants are not secured. Another challenge, because BRIDGE is unable to secure individualized data from the elementary schools, BRIDGE does not have quantitative data and concrete evidence to document its impacts at the individual- and aggregate-level. This is especially important for advocating and fundraising for its project. Finally, a third challenge is the recent news of Daniel Webster’s relocation for the next SY. Because the new location extends beyond the distance of the current route, HGP staff need to quickly think about if/how it can sustain the momentum, particularly since 57 percent (and possibly more) of the “riders” attend Daniel Webster.

5.2.1.7 Recommendations

Many of my recommendations are data-related. I think this is critical particularly when staff are trying to understand their impact on student attendance rates, that they are able to compare it to students’ academic records. It is also important to create a data infrastructure that allows longitudinal tracking, combining both the school-level data and the HGP (and other related) data. It would be a powerful set of analyses to show the schools as well as prospective funders (and academics or sites looking for how to improving educational outcomes) the impact of their work at the individual- and program-level. Specifically, since BRIDGE is nearing its completion of another SY with the WSB, it would be interesting to see what patterns emerge.

To understand more about social cohesion—particularly from riders and volunteers themselves—I recommend implementing a pre- and post-survey (for example at one or two points in time during a given school year) among CHLs, children and parents to learn about if they met new parents/children since the WSB, their sense of relationship since participating and if they get together beyond the WSB (and importantly, if WSB can be attributable for those relationships).

Programmatically, HGP staff should devise a long-term plan that considers how to maintain strong attendance rates beyond elementary school. For example, I did not learn of any activities that address
truancy issues of middle- and high-school; and while a WSB might not be the appropriate vehicle, it is critical to think about how to intervene at that level or sustain momentum established from the WSB. This can also have implications on college and employment attendance patterns.

In terms of fostering cohesion between North and South side children, one idea is to create stops on the North side as well as on the South side (that are not in the public housing development). Based on the current route to Daniel Webster, there is only a small span where North side children can join. With the relocation of Daniel Webster, the new route might already make room for this. This can also be an opportunity to engage North side parents to help with the “bus.” However, the questions of do the current CHLs have the capacity to manage more children, does HGP have the capacity to hire additional CHLs and should HGP assume responsibility for North side children are important to consider.

5.2.1.8 Implications

The walking school bus has significant implications for communities working on education, community development and social cohesion. It is a relatively low-cost program considering the tremendous impacts it has been having; it costs about $35,000 a year to implement, which accounts for CHL and Director staff outreach and implementation time, children’s incentives and outreach materials. The program is something most communities would be concerned about and could agree on. It also can have impacts on transportation like with the pedestrian improvements and traffic calming solutions that are being constructed because of the walking school bus, but will address a longstanding problem in the community with unsafe vehicles as well as poorly designed and maintained spaces.

There are many ways this program can go after its two years of implementation. As BRIDGE approaches breaking ground on construction, which will ultimately have impacts on the WSB routes, it will need to think strategically about how to sustain and build off of its success.

5.2.2 Exemplary activity 2: Potrero Healthy Living Zumba class

Zumba is one activity under the Potrero Healthy Living program, which has been unanimously pointed to by community stakeholders for its impact on community cohesion between North and South side
residents. Zumba classes take place at the NABE, contrary to other Healthy Living activities, which take place at Potrero Terrace-Annex. Aligning with TICB principles to provide high-quality services to residents and ensure activities are accessible, a professional instructor leads the Zumba classes and people of all ages and skill levels are welcome to participate.

Figures 5.11 and 5.12 (left to right)
Location of Zumba classes at the NABE and snapshot of Zumba class
Source Bing Maps and Rebuild Potrero website

When Zumba was initially launched, it met once a week, but after a year of consistent participation and increasing resident demand, BRIDGE staff added another class. As Weinstein noted, “Zumba was successful pretty much off the bat. Let’s say three months in, people were asking for another Zumba class. I said, ‘We will start another Zumba class if we can maintain participation for a year.’” Among all CBI activities, Zumba classes have had the highest attendance levels, particularly in engaging residents outside of public housing. Unfortunately, because of how Zumba attendance is currently being tracked—tallies per class, not delineated by each individual—it is unclear the number and patterns of
individual participation. Table 5.6 below illustrates monthly participation rates across all Healthy Living activities; and one can glean that Zumba participation trumps all activities.\(^52\)

Table 5.6. Participation by activity, by month (July 2013 – October 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumba</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Club</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Living Workshop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Group</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Workdays</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 341\)

Source: BRIDGE administrative data, November 2014

When Zumba was first conceptualized as a CBI activity, it was seen for its potential to leverage other opportunities. For example, in a 2014 BRIDGE press release, the Vice President of Programs and Services and Director of Rebuild Potrero, shared:

A Zumba class is less about exercise than it is about engaging community members in a participatory, rewarding activity. Participation can then be leveraged to have a conversation about residents’ health needs, which can then spark a dialogue with local health providers about how they are engaging residents (or not) and how systems can change to better serve residents’ needs. While the content is health, the activity’s purpose is engagement, empowerment, and influence on the systems that impact residents (BRIDGE 2014a).

---

\(^52\) Numbers represent total attendance at each activity’s class, so participants are double-counted from month-to-month.
5.2.2.1 Zumba and trauma

With respect to trauma, the Zumba classes help residents, who have been historically divided, get to know one another. It allows residents to break down barriers of fear and clear up misperceptions that they may have thought about one another. The regular meeting space allows for regular interactions, twice a week, in a space that no one side claims territory over. The class also allows residents to get together around a fun activity, as opposed to only getting together at community meetings. Finally, BRIDGE’s investment to three years of free Zumba classes for the community thus far, demonstrates its commitment to the community, stability and hope for positive change. Or, as one South side resident put it, the Zumba class is a “tangible benefit of what’s to come [with the Rebuild] and a step towards progress as compared to the many broken promises that this [public housing] community has heard over the years.”

5.2.2.2 Social cohesion

In conversations with community stakeholders, most all respondents pointed to Zumba as the most successful example of social cohesion between North and South side residents. In fact, one North side resident said it is “the greatest success” of BRIDGE’s activities in bringing the community together. Many respondents allude to the fact that Zumba classes are incredibly diverse. For example, one Community Builder shared,

Take Zumba. You don’t know who is a [Potrero] Terrace, Annex or North side resident and can’t tell who is who...People are there, having fun, talking [and] leaving together. Some live in public housing, some don’t, and don’t nobody care. That right there, that’s a success. Don’t no one care and the thing is they have so much fun.

Similarly, a North side resident shared,

You go in there and there are all kinds of people--Black, White, Asian, Latino. There could be a millionaire dancing next to a public housing resident and they don’t care because they are just having fun.
5.2.2.3 Community capacity

The Zumba classes have also created opportunities for North and South side communities to work together to solve problems and establish social norms. A frequently mentioned story was about the Zumba “cheerleader” and how it was a bit of an adjustment for participants to understand his intentions and bold personality. As one North side resident put it:

He’s a pretty big black guy dancing around all these white women, who are probably not used to a guy like him...It used to be that some people who see him...[say] ‘who is this guy?’ He is dressed very colorfully with satin and beads and he would be yelling, ‘Do it. Dance. Come on.’ At first, people thought he was disturbing the class and someone should tell him to leave. But then everyone saw that he was just having a good time. And, now he’s considered the cheerleader. They all understand that he is there with the best intentions.

One Community Builder shared how some people—namely non-public housing residents—were scared of him. She vividly recalled someone asking her to make him leave. However, instead of making him leave or blocking him from the class, community building staff created a designated space for him on the dance floor and gave him the title of the Zumba “cheerleader.” And, when new people come to Zumba, staff introduce him as the “cheerleader” and point out his designated space. In fact, in the 2014 Mirant Settlement Report, he was mentioned as “the anointed Zumba class cheerleader, who is there every class to inspire participants to keep pushing on through to sustain exercising” (21).

5.2.2.4 Challenges

In terms of challenges, Zumba classes are harder to scale up as compared to other programs like the walking club, meditation or sober living classes because it requires funding to rent space at the NABE, which already seems to be approaching capacity, and to pay for the professional Zumba instructor. Also, because it is open to anyone, there could be a possibility that Potrero Terrace-Annex residents are crowded out of the classes. However, according to Banh, this does not seem to be a current problem.
5.2.2.5 Considerations

One of the frequently-cited reasons Zumba is a successful activity in bringing the communities together is its location—at the NABE—and its meeting times—in the evenings, when most North side residents are off of work. Some of the criticisms or barriers to the other CBI activities (i.e., the walking club, gardening classes and cooking workshops) are that they take place in the Potrero Terrace-Annex development, which some non-public housing residents report not feeling comfortable walking through, and during work hours on weekdays, when most North side residents are at work.

5.2.3 Exemplary activity 3: Community Building Group (CBG)

Community Building Group (CBG), which meets every other month at the NABE, is another CBI activity that many community stakeholders generally spoke highly of. Most stakeholders agree that CBG has been an important and effective space for residents in the broader community to build social cohesion and social capital and to increase the community’s capacity and engagement in political issues facing the broader Potrero Hill community.

For nearly six years, CBG has been a regular meeting place for residents of all incomes, backgrounds and tenures across Potrero Hill to come together. It began with monthly meetings and in 2011 cut down to meetings every other month. According to the 2014 Transformation Plan, CBG averages 35-40 people per meeting and the group comprises public housing residents, surrounding community members, community-based organization (CBO) representatives and other South Potrero stakeholders.
5.2.3.1 CBG and trauma

BRIDGE staff have been incredibly thoughtful about how to organize a space where residents from across the Hill can get together regularly to hear updates and voice concerns about the Rebuild and other projects in the neighborhood. They recognize that residents, primarily public housing residents, have immense fear, anxieties and mistrust with the Rebuild from past trauma—from isolation, economic disinvestment and undelivered plans, and in some cases, from displacement from other public housing redevelopment projects. So as to avoid re-traumatization, BRIDGE staff ensure as much transparency and inclusion as possible. With transparency, they are upfront about realistic project timelines and plans and therefore they do not overpromise. They also share as much information as possible on the Rebuild Potrero website, through newsletters and with making meeting materials available online. With inclusion, they involve residents in as many decisions as possible—i.e., in planning community projects and activities, in hiring a new Senior Community Builder and in restructuring the incentive structure, to name a few. This also speaks to their focus on resident empowerment, such that residents are not merely consumers or having plans “done” to them, but are “active participants” and sharing their expertise in what plans for their communities should look like.

5.2.3.2 Social cohesion and social capital

Second to Zumba, CBG meetings were the most widely cited activity for fostering community cohesion and building social capital. According to one North side resident,

“The meetings [are] the most successful community building activity BRIDGE created because it provides a meeting space for North and South side residents to come together, to share in a meal, for parents and children to participate in activities, games and raffles, and for everyone to hear updates about the rebuilding process. It is a space that is: one, consistent—will always be taking
place whether one attends every meeting or just comes whenever they have time; two, is well-run; and three, is just a good time to socialize and get a good meal.

CBG meetings have also been a critical “access point” for residents to meet their neighbors and residents in the broader community. A couple of people mentioned how they have wanted to meet families in public housing, but have either been fearful of walking in the development or have not had other places to do so, so CBG meetings provides that space for interaction.

CBG meetings have also been helpful with creating a “sense of identification and commonality” as described by one South side resident. Residents I interviewed described how they are beginning to recognize other residents from CBG meetings at different community events (not organized by BRIDGE) and how they are starting to wave and say hello to one another at bus stops and as they walk through the neighborhood. One South side homeowner described his experience as such,

We’re moving from just being courteous to now having repeated opportunities to interact...and it’s amazing how quickly you can have that connection. I know feel a strong sense of connection with the people I’ve met...as a result of the Community Building Group meetings.

One consultant shared how she felt CBG meetings had more of a feeling of unity, or in her words, “[there was]...never a feeling of separateness.” In fact, she went on to say how BRIDGE created a “very familial dynamic and open conversation,” and recounting instances where when new residents, or families from the North side, came to CBG meetings, how everyone was incredibly welcoming to them.

Similarly, the various community advisory committees and action teams have allowed residents from the North and South side (public housing and non-public housing residents) to build bonds and regular interaction. One committee member shared, “…having opportunities on the advisory committee and talking about problems and working on something. That’s really what it takes to build relationships.“
5.2.3.3 Civic engagement and civic capacity

Early outcomes around civic engagement and participation among BRIDGE’s various community building activities suggest that CBG meetings have been a critical, useful and “unifying space” for the North and South side residents to come together and tackle issues pertaining to the Rebuild (and other community projects), to build community capacity and to address “systems change.” However, participation between North and South side community stakeholders has been uneven and while there has been some success at building the community’s capacity—namely, for South side residents—there is still an uneven level of capacity between North and South side residents. Additionally, there is also a sense that residents are “just tired” and ready to see change.

Unlike other developers who have created participatory governance mechanisms and meetings that have been compartmentalized—for example, separate meetings for renters and homeowners—BRIDGE has successfully established a community meeting time and space for all community stakeholders to come together—those including residents of ownership and renter tenures and varying incomes as well as stakeholders who might work or utilize services or amenities in the area. In this way, stakeholders are not being segregated and categorized in a particular “group” (as is common in mixed-income developments, where there are often separate homeowners and renter association meetings (Chaskin & Joseph 2010).

Similarly, no one group has more “ownership” of a meeting, activity or space, than another group. However, in conversations with some North side residents, it is still perceived CBG meetings are more “for” public housing residents, described by a few stakeholders, and that there is still some “us versus them” dynamics that play out with comments like “people over there [meaning the North side].”

In spite of these issues, some residents still feel the meetings are “critical” and “instrumental” for the Potrero Hill community. Described by one stakeholder, “a meeting like this didn’t exist before [CBG meetings].” One North side resident shared, “it is the only space for the North and South sides to regularly come together.” The same resident went on to say that BRIDGE should continue the meetings even after construction starts and is completed. And that if they were to stop, “then all of the community building work would be a huge waste.”
CBG meetings have also been a critical point of entry for many North side residents—namely those who might have just moved to the community or have not been engaged prior—and other community stakeholders wanting to learn how to be engaged and to meet their neighbors—particularly in Potrero Terrace-Annex. According to one North side resident, “...CBG meetings was where I first learned about what is going on with the Rebuild Potrero work and it was a place to get to know my neighbors—from both the North side as well as on the South side.” The resident goes on to say how, after attending one meeting—and being pleased with its content—the resident brought its partner and other residents who had not been engaged with any of the Rebuild efforts. And, since then, they have continued attending regularly. Stakeholders also noted how the “consistency” of the meeting was important. One person noted, “I can miss a couple of months, but still know there will continue to be meetings.”

As briefly touched on above, there was resounding consensus that CBG meetings have been “well-run” and an “enjoyable” time. As several North side residents describe, the meetings are helpful way to hear what’s going on in the community, discuss and weigh in on political issues affecting their community and be apart of the conversation. Many stakeholders also reported that they like how the meeting is held at a “neutral” space, at the NABE.

In many ways, BRIDGE’s various community engagement activities—not limited to CBG meetings, but the various planning processes of the Transformation Plan and the People Plan, the committee groups responsible for planning the community-wide events, and the meetings around other community projects—like the pedestrian improvement project—have provided North and South side residents numerous opportunities to engage in various decision-making of plans and programs. As described by one stakeholder, “After the Transformation Plan was completed, since residents were already engaged, we were able to engage them in other projects like the PEOPLE Plan, the pedestrian improvement project, etc.” With the completion of each process or project, residents have increased their capacity—in both, confidence and subject knowledge—to engage in other, future projects.

The various committees and action teams, which one consultant described as being “incredibly, socio-economically, culturally and religiously diverse,” have also increased the broader community’s capacity
to work together to solve problems. One North side resident share, “We got to learn from one another. [The committees were the] best thing...it was organic learning between residents.”

Since its inception, CBG has initiated and organized several community-building activities such as the building of a community garden on site, an oral history project and a Dream Box art project and leveraged the meeting group for other projects taking place in Potrero Terrace and Annex, including the PARADISE Plan, and the broader Potrero Hill neighborhood, including the NTP.

One of the most critical impacts of this group has been its ability to be leveraged for various community projects. Since its initiation, numerous project teams and consultants have attended CBG meetings to present their work and solicit community feedback. Rather than creating new meetings for people to attend, the CBG space provides a consistent and authentic space where residents are already gathering—and again, “meet[ing] residents where they are.”

5.2.3.4 Systems change

Contrary to traditional community engagement processes where consultants and city officials organize community meetings and invite residents/stakeholders to come, CBG meetings have provided the alternative meeting “space” and “time” for funders, planners and consultants to “come to residents”—changing the system of how typical community engagement occurs. Described by one stakeholder:

...there are so many pieces of...Rebuild Potrero and there are constantly multiple initiatives going on—transportation study, different grants, students and different studies—and everyone wants a piece of the residents. What the community building activities allow us to do is have a place—a meeting taking place regardless of any other things happening. So a transportation consultant can come in and engage residents; but it’s an authentic place because that meeting is taking place whether or not the transportation consultant is coming. So those participants in the walking club, for example, are now participating in the pedestrian improvement project as part of the larger project. That’s a different environment than trying to bring together a focus group. If we tried to do outreach every single time [there was a project], we wouldn’t be successful.
One consultant who helped with the PARADISE Plan described how her team was able to use the existing CBG meetings to collect and share information for their work:

We were able to hit ground running, because community was already ripe and ready and they already had community activities—like Zumba, the community garden, charrettes, walking club—and a community engagement process in place. So when we showed up, we were able to build on their momentum.

5.2.3.5 Challenges

While I heard many things about CBG meetings, there did not seem to be much of a consensus about how residents and stakeholders perceive and experience these meetings. One North side resident shared how "Some people [still] feel isolated and not part of the community."

Many pointed to the fact that meetings are still pretty uneven in terms of regular participation levels. For example, many stakeholders describe how the meetings are usually split 80/20, with 80 percent Potrero Terrace-Annex residents. [Insert data stats?] Stakeholders also describe how meeting participation among North side residents tended to be more in the early years—from 2008 to 2010 during the development of the Transformation Plan—and at present, tends to spike when there are physical design decisions that need to be made or when projects can affect their property values.

Numerous stakeholders describe that the ebbing and flowing of participation can be attributed to several reasons: first, that meetings have been taking place for over six years now—"...people are just tired, we’ve been planning for six years now" noted one stakeholder. Another stakeholder shared he got the sense that “people [at Potrero Terrace-Annex] care less about what it looks like, they just want it done...they just want it safer tomorrow.” Third, people’s schedules and commitments have changed over the past years. “I know one woman, who is from the North side, who used to be heavily involved, but now she’s busy with her work,” shared one stakeholder.

While the 80 percent share of Potrero Terrace-Annex attendance seems plentiful, one North side resident expressed concern about the depth of BRIDGE’s engagement, “...It seems to be the same 50-
60 people [Potrero Terrace-Annex] who attend now. And it makes me wonder about their [BRIDGE’s] reach as there are over one thousand residents living there.” This also seems to be the case with other resident-led activities, like the committee groups, TICB activity leadership—“it’s many of the same people leading this activity or that committee.”

In one interview with a North side resident, the person described how while South side residents might outnumber North side residents in community meetings, North side residents are the ones voicing their concerns at those meetings, but also they know to contact their local supervisors and the mayor. Underserved communities just don’t have the organizing instincts as more affluent communities. One stakeholder shared, “…[it’s] difficult to engage people if they don’t feel empowered to contribute.”

There is also a language barrier, with respect to technical planning and design jargon, that one stakeholder described is not unique to Potrero Terrace-Annex residents, but the broader Potrero Hill community: “…We’re just not speaking at the same frequency.”

Most importantly, several stakeholders described the challenge of sustaining community engagement after six years of planning and not having anything physical—like a crane—as a sign that “change is coming.”

5.2.4 Exemplary activity 4: Unite Potrero Community-Wide Events

Each year, BRIDGE hosts Unite-Potrero community-wide events to bring the diverse communities of Potrero Hill together for “a shared positive experience and to build a sense of social cohesion” (BRIDGE 2014b, 16). Community events are conceived of and implemented by event committees comprised of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents, Potrero Hill community members, Rebuild Potrero staff, and other Potrero stakeholders. While there have been numerous events since the planning began, including a tree and vegetable planting, two outdoor movie nights and parties with games and food, many stakeholders point to the Unite Potrero Community Walk and community mural as exemplary examples of building cohesion among residents from all over Potrero Hill.
5.2.4.1 Unite Potrero Community Walk

The Unite Potrero Community Walk, which was organized by one of the action teams (Unite Potrero Social Outreach and Action Team), took place in the fall of 2011. Nearly 50 community members from across Potrero Hill, as well as Supervisor Malia Cohen, participated in the informative walk through the neighborhood. The walk started on the North side, at the newly renovated Potrero Hill Public Library, then made its way through the South side, stopping at the FRC, the watermelon house (though not an official stop, but still noteworthy of mention) and Starr King Open Space. The last stop was the NABE. Along the way, residents got stamps in their “passports” once they reached each stop. Residents learned about the history of different places, sampled fruit from the FRC community garden, and met residents from across the Hill. At the culmination of the walk, the community engaged in activities, enjoyed snacks and watched a movie organized at the NABE.
About 50 Potrero Hill residents and neighbors participated in the neighborhood tour, and at the last stop, over 100 adults and kids spent the rest of the afternoon getting their faces painted, making slime with volunteers from the San Francisco Exploratorium, decorating pens with staff of the Potrero Recreational Center, and painting tiles to be placed on the site of the future Rebuild Potrero neighborhood.

5.2.4.2 Community mural

Early 2014, CBG members initiated and organized another community-wide mural: the painting of a community mural. The mural was first conceived as a strategy to abate graffiti on Potrero Hill Health Center, which is located across the street of Potrero Terrace-Annex. Then, someone came up with the idea to paint a mural on it—“to have a point of beauty and unity in the neighborhood,” described by
one Community Builder. The Junior Community Builder surveyed the neighborhood and found the Potrero Hill Clinic as the ideal location because it has been vandalized numerous times and is relatively close to the border of the North and South side.

BRIDGE sponsored the mural with support from Potrero Hill Health Center, the NABE and Precita Eyes Muralists Association and Center (Precita Eyes), a community-based mural arts organization that seeks to beautify urban environments and educate communities about the process and history of public community mural art. Precita Eyes led over 50 community members through two design workshops to solicit ideas, images and themes for the mural. On a May 2014 weekend, community members from Potrero Terrace-Annex and the broader Hill spent a day painting the mural. The event was widely advertised to the community and it had a great turnout from residents across the Hill. After some minor touch-ups by Precita Eyes artists, the following month, over 100 community members gathered at Potrero Hill Health Center to celebrate the unveiling of the mural.
The mural reflects Potrero Hill's past, present and future, including institutions such as Starr King, Daniel Webster, Potrero Recreation Center and the NABE. It also includes images of children in the walking school bus, the now discontinued 53 bus line and the Texas Street Farm. There are symbols representing diversity, nature, and love, including a pregnant woman encircled by five hands symbolizing the five elements (earth, water, wind, fire and metal). Surrounding the mural are the names of Potrero political, cultural and social leaders (Rebuild Potrero Newsletter July 2014).

In addition to community members, several civic, health and nonprofit leaders were in attendance to commemorate this special occasion. For example, Malia Cohen, District 10 Supervisor, Jan Gurley, Potrero Hill Health Center Director and Edward Hatter and The NABE Executive Director were among those in attendance.

5.2.4.3 Unite Potrero and trauma
The explicit naming of “Unite Potrero” addresses the trauma of a divided Hill and a future unified community. Similar to Zumba classes, both the Community Walk and community mural provide residents from both the North and South sides to tear down barriers that have historically divided them—i.e., misperceptions, fear, among others. The community-wide activities allowed residents to experience—in many cases, for the first time—walking through one another’s communities. And, like the WSB, opportunities to walk together or to create something in a community together, like the mural, helps build bonds and a sense of community ownership over places and spaces.

5.2.4.4 Social cohesion

For many North side residents, the Community Walk was their first time walking through the neighborhood’s public housing. Several stakeholders described how it was a great opportunity of bringing the North and South sides together, of learning each others’ stories and where one another lives. For many residents it was more than just a walk and history lesson, it was an opportunity to learn about their neighbors in the community and to see the beginning of a unified neighborhood.

Numerous people noted how planning and painting the community mural helped residents build community with one another. It was an opportunity for some residents to see their histories and families’ generations in Potrero Hill and to be able to share with others. This allowed for residents to connect in new ways. The event was also described as an entry point for non-public housing residents, who had not yet been connected to the community building activities, to learn about BRIDGE’s work and to get involved with future activities. In an interview with a South side resident, this is how he and his wife, neighbors and friends first got connected to BRIDGE’s work and what led to their continued engagement with HGP activities and CBG meetings.

Several people described how the fact that the community mural has not been vandalized illustrates a social norm. “These are spaces the community created together, so there’s a level of respect for those places,” shared one Community Builder.
5.2.4.5 Considerations

Many stakeholders suggested that these events should not be one-off events. In fact, two stakeholders—both North side residents—suggested that the Community Walk occur every year to continually educate community residents about the history of the neighborhood, key neighborhood assets and for opportunities to build community with their neighbors, especially those who they might not yet know. Similarly, a couple of stakeholders recommended that another (or a series of other) community murals be painted in other parts of Potrero Hill in keeping with the continuity across the Hill. The major challenges with having annual Community Walks and subsequent murals are related to funding and coordination. Both events require lots of coordination among the various providers who were involved in the first walk and they are expensive.

5.3. Analysis against existing frameworks

Finally, an important way to substantiate TICB’s validity is to assess its approach against other evidence-based frameworks. For this thesis, I focus on two such frameworks: The Full Frame Initiative (FFI) and Resident-Centered Community Building. In what follows are brief overviews of each framework and my assessment of how TICB aligns with the core dimensions of each approach.

5.3.1. Full Frame Initiative

FFI was co-founded by Katya Fels Smyth and Lisa Goodman based off of Smyth’s experience working with homeless women and both of their analyses examining what makes organizations effective in serving people with multiple challenges and having lasting change. What Smyth and Goodman found was that to effectively work with highly marginalized people—i.e., people experiencing homelessness, addiction, abuse, mental illness in a context of entrenched poverty and violence—one must examine and support people in the “full frame” of their lives. Taken from the film industry, this idea of “full frame” approach...
suggests zooming as far back as possible from an individual and seeing the full context of his/her life—the environment, relationships, events and interactions that define and are defined by the character.

Grounded in theory, FFI argues that to serve people and communities in the full context of their lives, one must simultaneously address five domains of wellbeing:

- **Social connectedness** to people and communities,
- **Safety** of being able to be our authentic selves without significant harm,
- **Stability** from having some predictability in our lives and having the sense that one small obstacle won’t send our whole lives into chaos,
- **Mastery** of the skills and empowerment to exert control and choice in life,

54 Social connectedness is (1) the degree to which a person has and perceives a sufficient number and diversity of relationships that allow her or him to give and receive information, emotional support, and material aid; (2) create a sense of belonging and value; and (3) foster growth. This is related to reciprocity, belonging, social capital, social cohesion, social integration, social networks, social support, reduced social isolation and exclusion. Social connectedness is important because it provides people with the emotional support, material help and information they need to thrive. The evidence base supporting this domain can be found here: http://fullframeinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/SocialConnectedness_Factsheet.pdf

55 Safety is the degree to which a person can be her or his authentic self and not be at heightened risk of physical or emotional harm. This is related to security, absence of harm, risk or danger. Safety is a basic human need, strongly connected to overall wellbeing and quality of life. When a person’s or community’s safety is threatened, it leads to direct harm, and also challenges a person’s beliefs that the world is just and fair. The absence of safety can have severe mental and physical health consequences. The evidence base can be found here: http://fullframeinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Safety_Factsheet.pdf

56 Stability is the degree to which a person can expect her or his situation and status to be fundamentally the same from one day to the next, where there is adequate predictability for a person to concentrate on the here-and-now and on the future, growth and change, and where small obstacles don’t set off big cascades. This is related to adversity, control, predictability, resource, safety net, stress, stressor, resiliency, permanency and certainty. Stability provides a foundation for health, productivity and wellness. Stability interacts with all facets of an individual’s life and can lead to a sense of control and predictability that is vital for individuals and communities to thrive. Because stability impacts individuals, families and communities, stability (or instability) can have cascading effects. This means that stability (or instability) in one area of life may positively (or negatively) impact stability in other areas of life, including physical well-being. The stability (or instability) that is present in a person’s life may also add to or decrease the stability of those around her or him. The evidence base can be found here: http://fullframeinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Stability_Factsheet.pdf

57 Mastery is the degree to which a person feels in control of her or his fate and the decisions she or he makes, and where she or he experiences some correlation between efforts and outcomes. This is related to coping, meaning-making, post-traumatic growth, reflective capacity, resilience, control, choice, self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-confidence, empowerment, applying knowledge. People do not function equally in all parts of their lives. Successfully accomplishing goals in particular areas of life is called “self-efficacy.” People have a sense of efficacy in multiple areas of their lives (e.g. their role as parent, employee or student). However, mastery is an overall sense of control that a person has over her or his life. People also must feel that they have a direct influence on their environment. A person who feels little or no control over, or ability to change, her or his life or environment will likely have difficulty accomplishing goals and facing challenges in many areas. Mastery is the primary motivator for perseverance and personal change. The evidence base can be found here: http://fullframeinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Mastery_Factsheet.pdf
• Meaningful access to relevant mainstream resources involving the ability to meet our basic needs without shame, danger or hardship.\textsuperscript{58}

The FFI factsheets indicated in the respective footnotes provide greater detail on each of the domains—in terms of definitions, related terms, importance and supporting evidence. The systems-change approach is envisioned to break cycles of poverty and problems by leveraging what is already working and building on assets while minimizing tradeoffs with other domains of wellbeing.
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5.3.1.1 Assessment of TICB on Full Frame Initiative

Before delving into my assessment, it is important to first note that FFI is applied more to programs and services interventions. And, because TICB is not a programs and services intervention, rather a framework that prefaces and lays the foundation and support for effective programs and services delivery and creates conditions for long-term community and individual change, FFI's domain of "meaningful access to relevant resources" might not be completely relevant. However, in spite of this difference, I do believe that viewed holistically, the TICB framework aligns very closely with the five domains of wellbeing as well as

\textsuperscript{58} Meaningful access to relevant resources is the degree to which a person can meet needs particularly important for her or his situation in ways that are not overly onerous, and are not degrading or dangerous. This is related to access, disparity, inequity to access, having knowledge, meeting "basic" needs, cultural competency (of resources), utilization rates, service integration/defragmentation, reduced barriers, information and referral and navigation. Meaningful access allows people to fulfill their needs in ways that don't create other challenges to their physical or emotional wellbeing. Lack of meaningful access may have significant long-term impact on people's wellbeing, particularly if needs are met through onerous, degrading or dangerous ways. The evidence base can be found here: http://fullframeinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Meaningful-Access_factsheet.pdf
the 10 principles under FFI. While I will not go through each of the principles, I will briefly discuss each of FFI's five domains of wellbeing.

Table 5.7. TICB against Full Frame Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFI DOMAINS</th>
<th>TICB Principles or Strategies</th>
<th>Potrero Terrace-Annex activities/opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social connectedness         | "Interpersonal" strategies to support peer-to-peer activities and interactions; shared positive experiences; personal sharing and mutual support | • Annual community-wide events (community walk, neighborhood party)  
• Daily community building activities (walking club, gardening program)  
• Community-wide projects (oral history project, community mural, Dream Box project)  
• Peer mentoring (Healthy Generations Project, gardening and sober living and meditation activities) |
| Safety                       | Principle 2: Acceptance  
"Individual" strategy to meet residents where they are and to set realistic expectations and never over promise | • Residents do not need to qualify for any activities or events  
• All activities are free, open and no experience is necessary  
• Residents are not disqualified for any activities |
| Stability                    | Principle 1: Do no harm  
"Community" strategy to ensure that sustainability and quality is criteria for implementation and involvement in community efforts | • High-quality activities/events  
• Secured with multiple years of funding  
• Long-term approach  
• Consistent communication through hand-delivered calendars and website |
| Mastery                      | Principle 3: Community empowerment  
"Community" strategy to cultivate community leadership through support and skill-building | • Peer mentoring (Healthy Generations Project, gardening and sober living and meditation activities)  
• Participation and engagement (CBG meetings, Transformation Plan, People Plan)  
• Planning and problem-solving (Action teams, CBG meetings) |
| Meaningful access to relevant resources | Principle 4: Reflective process | • Creating activities that meet resident needs; responsive and adjusting to new developments/knowledge of resident needs; and referrals to programs and services |

For social connectedness, TICB is intentional about interpersonal strategies that allow residents to have many opportunities for positive experiences, for sharing about their personal lives and for modeling what a peer-to-peer mentoring relationship can look like. This is evident in Potrero Terrace-Annex with the annual community-wide events (community walk, neighborhood party), host of daily community building...
activities (walking club, gardening program), community-wide projects (oral history project, community mural, Dream Box project), and peer mentoring (Healthy Generations Project, gardening and sober living and meditation activities).

TICB’s explicit principle of “acceptance” speaks to its alignment with FFI in ensuring that residents feel safe about being themselves, recognizing their personal struggles and setting realistic goals for them to achieve and not putting residents in vulnerable situations for risks. At Potrero Terrace-Annex, residents are welcome to any and all events; no experience or verification of any sort is necessary and nothing can disqualify them from participating.

The most frequently discussed principle of TICB among staff and residents was deliberate consistency, which speaks to FFI’s stability domain. Staff recognize that residents have been exposed to many inconsistencies with various programs and services that have come and go (or were of poor quality) and broken promises by previous project efforts; so staff ensure to only engage activities that are high-quality, have secured multiple years of funding and can be offered consistently and for the long-term. This aligns with its first principle to “do no harm.” As tangible evidence of this stability, staff at Potrero Terrace-Annex distribute monthly calendars to each of the resident’s mailboxes with all of the TICB events and activities. They have successfully implemented this method for over four years. Staff also maintains a project website (www.rebuildpotrero.com) with the same updated information, so residents can also access information electronically.

Another critical component of TICB is this notion of community empowerment (one of its principles), which speaks to FFI’s mastery domain. TICB recognizes the importance of self-determination, inclusion, participation, ownership and capacity building and woven throughout its various strategies are efforts to increase residents’ mastery in these and other areas. For example, strategies focus on cultivating community leadership through support and skill-building, opportunities for resident voices to be heard and incorporated in community plans and opportunities for residents to plan events and problem-solve together.

Finally, while TICB is not a service delivery intervention, it has embedded specific “systems” strategies to ensure residents have access to critical services. For example, it speaks to building partnerships for
long-term investments in community change and effective service delivery and ensuring activities and opportunities are responsive and adaptive to new developments and knowledge.

5.3.2. Resident-centered community building

In 2012, the Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation and the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change’s co-convened 41 leaders of community building efforts to discuss effective strategies and lessons from their community building work. Leaders represented a diverse set of perspectives from volunteer resident activists to staff at local community organizations, agencies and service providers. From the daylong collective learning and sharing environment, they arrived at the Resident-Centered Community Building framework, which includes a cornerstone, four building blocks, example strategies, and four building blocks.

They argue that the cornerstone of community building is relationships: relationships among residents; relationships between residents and neighborhood institutions and relationships between residents and community change agents.

The building blocks and example strategies include:

1. Create multiple ways for people to engage and contribute
2. Build trust and capacity—creating a foundation for ongoing voluntary engagement of many residents

They also include six guiding principles, which include: (1) Develop their own relationships with residents of the community; (2) Create and support opportunities for residents to build ties with each other; (3) Foster ways to combine external expertise and local knowledge; (4) Facilitate constructive relationships between the community and powerful institutions; (5) Encourage outside supporters of CB to cooperate and collaborate with one another; and (6) Develop the evidence base about the value of community building.

Find people’s passion (exercise, sports, performing arts); meet people where they are (existing events and gathering spots like church, barbershop, PTA meetings); Create spaces, place and reasons for people to come together (community cleanup or seasonal/holiday events); Be flexible about how people participate; Respect people’s time (meetings should only be held when needed and well-run); Make it fun and easy to participate (provide food and childcare); and Make efforts to reach the hard to reach (for seniors, people with disabilities, immigrants, marginalized youth, higher-income gentri-fiers)

Start wherever the energy lies—no best “first activity”; Don’t be afraid to start small—gives visibility and shows small steps; Build capacity, not dependency; Look for opportunities to broaden and deepened the work; Be accountable to the community—it’s the
3. Communicate often and in many ways—critical to motivating, mobilizing, connecting, collaborating, accomplishing, informing and celebrating. There has to be follow-through. Too many groups come through our neighborhoods and gain our trust, and then don’t do what they say they’re going to do. Promises are made and not delivered on. This creates distrust in the future. When everyone else—the funders, the private investors—has gone away, the community is still there.

        –Valerie Joiner, Participant of Aspen Institute Roundtable

4. Build the foundations for long-term work.

5.3.2.1 Assessment of TICB on Resident-Centered Community Building

Overall, TICB aligns very closely with the Resident-Centered Community Building framework. In fact, it is hard to find where they do not align. Similar to my FF3 assessment, I will not go through each of the principles and example strategies under the Resident-Centered Community Building framework; however, I will briefly discuss each of the four building blocks.

Table 5.8. TICB against Resident Centered Community Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TICB</th>
<th>Principles or Strategies</th>
<th>Potrero Terrace-Annex activities/opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENT-CENTERED COMMUNITY BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create multiple ways for people to engage and contribute</td>
<td>“Individual” strategy to provide opportunities for multiple interactions</td>
<td>• Annual community-wide events (community walk, neighborhood party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Daily community building activities (walking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

key to building trust (builds credibility and legitimacy; accountability is key; trust is key to effective relationships); and Take into account the historical factors that have undermined capacity and trust

62 Listen to the community (listening tours, conduct surveys, or hold a series of meetings); Develop a deliberate communications plan (informing residents about the progress, newsletters, email, social media and websites)

Choose the most effective messengers (resident leaders); Think creatively about informal and personal communication opportunities (religious leaders, beauticians, store owners); Translate everything (translators at meetings and translated meeting materials); Avoid jargon (use everyday language); Communicate to audiences outside of the neighborhood (local media, government officials, leaders in other neighborhoods and advocates)

63 Set goals, but be prepared to adapt to changing circumstances; Build in a process for learning and reflecting

Create opportunities for leaders to rest and re-energize; Integrate new leadership development into everything

Aim for weightlessness; Celebrate; Think carefully about how large and formal the management and financial structures should be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build trust and capacity-creating a foundation for ongoing voluntary engagement of many residents</th>
<th>Principle 2: Acceptance</th>
<th>Principle 3: Community empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Community&quot; strategy to ensure that sustainability and quality is criteria for implementation and involvement in community efforts</td>
<td>Residents do not need to qualify for any activities or events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the foundations for long-term work</td>
<td>Principle 1: Do no harm</td>
<td>Principle 4: Reflective process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate often and in many ways—critical to motivating, mobilizing, connecting, collaborating, accomplishing, informing and celebrating</td>
<td>Consistent communication through hand-delivered calendars and website, newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Individual&quot; strategy to meet residents where they are and to set realistic expectations and never over promise</td>
<td>Spanish and Cantonese translators at meetings and activities (and translated materials)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Interpersonal&quot; strategies to support peer-to-peer activities and interactions; shared positive experiences; personal sharing and mutual support</td>
<td>Participation and engagement (CBG meetings, Transformation Plan, People Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Community&quot; strategies to provide visible, tangible activities that reflect community change and to cultivate community leadership through support and skill-building</td>
<td>Planning and problem-solving (Action teams, CBG meetings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-quality activities/events</td>
<td>Creating activities that meet resident needs; responsive and adjusting to new developments/knowledge of resident needs; and referrals to programs and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation and engagement (CBG meetings, Transformation Plan, People Plan)</td>
<td>Long-term approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and problem-solving (Action teams, CBG meetings)</td>
<td>Consistent communication through hand-delivered calendars and website, newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Cantonese translators at meetings and activities (and translated materials)</td>
<td>Participation and engagement (CBG meetings, Transformation Plan, People Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and problem-solving (Action teams, CBG meetings)</td>
<td>Planning and problem-solving (Action teams, CBG meetings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beginning with the cornerstone of relationships, TICB recognized that for any community building effort to be effective and lay the foundation to have enduring change in individuals and communities, intentional strategies needed to be embedded at each of the ecological levels. Ultimately, these get to the relationships at all three levels that the Resident Centered Community Building framework suggests.

In terms of the building blocks, staff were incredibly thoughtful about creating multiple ways for people to engage and contribute. They recognized early on that when dealing with trauma-impacted communities, it often requires multiple touches to get residents engaged, which is why they were explicit in their “individual” strategy about “providing opportunities for multiple interactions” as well as using incentives as sense of personal reward for their engagement and time.

Second, they knew that building resident trust and capacity was critical for both community healing from past traumas, but also for increasing residents’ capacities to authentically and effectively engage with changes in their community. This is reflected in Potrero Terrace-Annex in the various committee groups that they developed for engaging in community processes, organizing community events and learning to work with other residents. Third, they recognized that communication is essential for stability and accountability. Their various communication forms and consistency with the monthly activity calendars have been tools to share information, be accountable to residents and celebrate community-wide accomplishments. Finally, TICB recognizes that for any change effort to be successful, there needs to be purposeful planning around building the foundations for long-term work.

5.3.3 Summary of assessment

Overall, this assessment suggests that TICB is approaching the work of community building from a “full frame” and “resident-centered” perspective.
Conclusion

In this concluding chapter, I assess the value of TICB as a whole by returning to my three research questions and examining how the collective strategies and activities implemented in Potrero Terrace-Annex fare against them. I conclude with key lessons learned, challenges for the field and recommendations for future implementation and research.

6.1 Overall assessment

While I believe TICB is still in its infancy in terms of understanding its implications for the field, its implementation and impacts in Potrero Hill show signs of promise. In particular, I believe its central tenet—of utilizing a “trauma-informed” lens—is critical not just for community building practice, but also for the field of community development. BRIDGE’s TICB work in Potrero Hill, specifically its recognition and understanding of individual’s and community’s collective set of past, present and future traumas, illuminates a critical dimension of how to effectively work with deeply impoverished and highly marginalized communities. This idea of deeper levels of engagement to first help individuals and communities heal and then to lay the foundation for renewed trust—among its community, with developers and among systems—allows for more responsive and sustainable improvements.

Similarly, while I also believe it is too soon to glean the full extent of TICB’s effectiveness, based on my case study of Potrero Hill, I believe its early impacts have been positive, particularly in: (1) addressing the social cohesion between socially- and economically-diverse communities, (2) increasing public housing residents’ civic capacity and (3) transforming democratic processes and the education system—though to a higher degree in the former two than the latter. In particular, I argue that BRIDGE’s Potrero work offers many useful in roads in selecting appropriate activities and employing effective administrative processes. To derive at this assessment, I ranked how BRIDGE’s overall program fared in addressing each of my research questions—giving each question a “high,” “moderate” or “low” success ranking
(Figure 6.1). I also list the relevant activities or opportunities that directly support my assessment. Finally, I provide a discussion about considerations and challenges with my findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTIONS</th>
<th>#1: Social cohesion between North &amp; South</th>
<th>#2: Increase residents' civic participation and capacity</th>
<th>#3: Transform systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of success</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant activities/ opportunities</td>
<td>Zumba, CBG, Action Teams, Advisory committees, Unite Potrero events</td>
<td>Jr. Community Builder, CBG, Action Teams, Advisory committees, HGP</td>
<td>HGP, CBG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.1 Research question #1: Social cohesion between North & South

In regards to my first question, the extent of increasing the social cohesion between North and South side residents, I believe the TICB program has been moderately successful. While social cohesion was the most frequently discussed topic among community stakeholders, experiences of positive social cohesion were not consistently reported across all interviewees. For example, several interviewees acknowledged how there are still some levels of "us versus them" dynamics between North and South side residents. As one North side resident described it, "There's been progress [in terms of cohesion], but it's still very divided on the Hill. [BRIDGE's work] hasn't solved everything, not that it could...I think BRIDGE has achieved a lot, but there's a lot more to be done." The "us versus them" dynamic is evident at community meetings, and especially evident on Potrero Hill's Next Door website, where recent posts are blaming public housing residents for crime on the Hill. In reaction to the Next Door posting, a Potrero Terrace-Annex resident shared, "There are some people who don't want us here [in Potrero Hill] and that's fine."

---

64 This assessment is based on those who have been engaged with community building activities; and does not capture non-participants.
The depth of cohesion also varies. On one end of the spectrum, respondents—mostly North side residents—described cohesion as more “casual”—i.e., recognizing one another at and outside of community building activities; simply saying “hello” as they pass each other by or friendly small talk exchanges at community meetings. On the other end, respondents—mostly non-public housing South side residents—described cohesion as “personal” and “strong,” extending beyond simply interacting during community building activities and more intentionality about getting together outside of activities, relying on one another for support and sharing in each others’ lives. Based on my stakeholder interviews, relationships with greater depth generally exist among residents who are much more intentional about pursuing these relationships—whether it is because they are generally interested in wanting to know their neighbors or because they are compelled by their religious or civic responsibilities.

6.1.1.1 Relevant activities / opportunities

The most effective activities and strategies in building cohesion include Zumba, CBG, Action Teams, Advisory committees and Unite Potrero events. Zumba has provided a fun and regular space for residents across the Hill to get together; and based on participation data, it appears to be the most widely attended activity among all of its activities. It also seems to have a pretty even split of North side vs. South side participants according to Community Building staff. This is likely because of the “neutrality” of its location residents often mentioned (The NABE), the time it is offered (in the evenings) and because it is fun (beyond master planning).

The second most frequently mentioned activities are the Unite Potrero community-wide events. North and South side residents I interviewed felt that these events, which have included the Community Walk, mural painting and neighborhood parties help to break down barriers (i.e., one’s fear of walking through public housing) and to help resolve misconceptions of the other (i.e., rationale for the “other’s” behavior). Numerous residents with whom I spoke with mentioned how it was at these community-wide events that they met residents in public housing or from other parts of the Hill for the first time and that they have maintained and deepened these relationships over time.
Third, the advisory groups (CBG, Action Teams and Advisory Committees) have also provided opportunities for North and South side residents to build cohesion. Many residents who were engaged in one or several of the groups felt these spaces were critical at establishing relationships with residents who one would not have otherwise known, to learn about each other’s personal stories, aspirations and struggles, and to see how they could be a resource to others. It also provided opportunities to work together and understand problems and solutions from different perspectives. Many felt they established meaningful and lasting relationships from these groups.

On the other hand, there have been a handful of activities that have not been as successful, based on participation data and interviews. These are often those that take place within the public housing development and occur during work hours. For example, while the community garden has weekend workdays, because it is located in Potrero Terrace-Annex, many North side residents shared they do not go because they still do not feel comfortable walking through the development. This does not seem to be the case for South side residents I interviewed, however, who shared how they feel comfortable walking through the development on their way to the gardening classes or for the walking club. The other activities like the walking club, meditation classes and sober living classes take place during work hours when most North side residents are at work. Also, the latter two take place in the development, which again is likely to result in lower North side participation. While non-public housing residents have not participated in HGP activities, there are a select few who volunteer and help with the various activities. So, in this sense, there has been some North and South cohesion with HGP.

6.1.2 Research question #2: Increase individual and community capacity

In terms of my second question, the extent of increasing public housing residents’ civic participation and capacity, I believe BRIDGE’s activities have been highly successful. Most notably, when I asked stakeholders about how one describes the success of BRIDGE’s community building work, many residents did not hesitate to point to the Junior Community Builder. “[The Junior Community Builder] is the success,” described one HOPE SF partner staff. “She has transformed to be the ‘unofficial mayor’ of

65 This is based off of the small subset of active participants I was able to analyze data for or interview stakeholders about.
Potrero Terrace-Annex,” described another, a South side resident. Several other Potrero Hill residents described how the Junior Community Builder has been an effective liaison between the residents and developer and has grown immensely with her community organizing skills. One stakeholder described her increased skills in organizing events like the Thanksgiving Dinner, active engagement on Next Door, leadership of community building activities, initiative with crowdsourcing funding for her college program (and interest to create a program to help other public housing residents pursue college).

These increased levels of capacity do not stop with her. As I learned in my interviews, many other residents have taken on more leadership roles and initiative with TICB activities and their own projects. For example, one regular TICB participant substitutes for the Junior Community Builder when she is out of town. He leads the walking club, cooking class and other Healthy Living activities and knows all of the procedures. As one Community Builder shared, “He never asked for anything...he is doing it because he wants to do it.” And, extending beyond TICB activities, I learned of numerous stories of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents, working together to create programs for residents they feel TICB activities are not reaching. One such idea is a mentorship program for young boys.

6.1.2.1 Relevant activities / opportunities

The most effective activities and strategies in fostering increased capacities involve the creation of the Junior Community Builder position (which I have already discussed in length), the various advisory groups (CBG, Action Teams and advisory committees) and HGP’s CHLs.

Residents’ experiences taking part in various advisory groups have allowed them to increase their capacities and involvement with civic issues. For example, since 2008, residents have had opportunities to participate in the development of the Transformation Plan, PARADISE Plan and the pedestrian improvement project. When residents were hired to implement the household survey for the PARADISE Plan, they gained valuable professional skills with managing their work schedules, learning interview protocols and data tracking. They have also initiated projects like the community garden and community mural and established two community building activities—the meditation and sober living group, which two residents currently lead. With the completion of each project, residents build relationships with one another, stronger team dynamics and momentum for subsequent projects. One
consultant described the advisory groups as “socio-economically, culturally and religiously diverse” and as having helped increase the broader community’s capacity to work together to solve problems. One North side resident said, “We got to learn from one another. [The committees were the] best thing...it was organic learning between [North and South side] residents.”

Third, HGP has provided CHLs with substantive opportunities to work among their peers, to increase their knowledge in child development and to be resources to their community. Since its implementation in 2013, they have increased from three CHLs to eight CHLs and are also thinking of starting a new position of Junior PHLs to get elementary-school children engaged early on with peer mentoring and community building.

6.1.3 Research question #3: Transform systems

Finally, in regards to my third question, the extent of transforming democratic processes and the education systems, I believe BRIDGE’s activities have had low success.66 There is some evidence that HGP is impacting the education and childcare systems with HGP and even the system of community engagement with CBG, but beyond these, no other such impacts in public safety or public health, for example, came up in my interviews. I do, however, acknowledge systems change is difficult and complex work, so I acknowledge the fact that BRIDGE has been able to have some impact on the education system.

6.1.4 How TICB addresses trauma

There are numerous ways in which BRIDGE’s practices address the underlying issues of trauma—those including past traumas, present traumas and trauma that are forthcoming with the Rebuild. One critical dimension revolves around consistency. Community building staff recognize the community’s history of broken promises, temporary programs and services and personal instabilities in education and

66 This conclusion is based on those who have been engaged with community building activities; this does not capture non-participants.
employment. For these reasons, staff ensure consistency throughout its work, from the consistency of delivering calendars to residents' mailboxes the same time each month, to keeping activities at the same days and time each week, to ensuring all activities on the calendar will be provided.

A second dimension relates to quality and professionalism. Recognizing the low-quality and uncoordinated programs and services that have come in and out of the community, BRIDGE ensures that its staff and administrative processes are professionalized—in that any residents who are employed or paid by BRIDGE (or any of the funds its raised) go through trainings and are expected to treat its work ethically and responsibly, so residents receive high-quality services. In some cases, BRIDGE contracts with professionals or experts to lead efforts beyond its internal capacities—i.e., the professional Zumba instructor, Unite Potrero events and the preparation of the PARADISE Plan.

A third dimension of its approach is both providing support for residents during traumatic experiences and increasing residents' capacities to prepare or cope with traumatic events that arise in their personal lives. This level of support is most prominent with HGP and the support CHLs provide children and parents who participate. HGP activities model to families how to build, or sustain, its own family's cohesion, but also how to build cohesion in its community. The parent-child activities also model relaxation techniques for coping with stress and parent-child interactions for developing a consistent routine of family bonding.

A fourth component is creating regular spaces of unity. Because residents on the Hill, as well as within Potrero Terrace-Annex, have over time become largely divided, BRIDGE has been intentional about creating regular spaces for residents to socialize. Physical spaces include the two community gardens, the spaces where HGP, sober living and meditation classes take place, the community mural and the space it rents at the NABE for CBG meetings and Zumba.

Finally, a fifth dimension is about being transparent and supportive. BRIDGE recognizes the trauma forthcoming with the reconstruction, as well as the relocation of Daniel Webster, can be detrimental to the community and the momentum it has established with those engaged, so it is focused on being as transparent about timing and realities of the process, in helping residents prepare for the changes and in
ensuring the case managers and service providers it works with provide the level of sensitivity and professionalism it has established over the six years.

6.2. Lessons learned

One of the major takeaways with TICB is that it is less about the specific activities one implements, and more about the approach of laying a foundation for future change. Several additional "lessons" I have gleaned from BRIDGE’s work at Potrero Terrace-Annex involve: (1) being intentional about community building for community building’s sake, (2) being opportunistic with every activity or event involving residents and (3) understanding how spatial decisions affect engagement.

6.2.1. Being intentional about community building for community building’s sake

First and foremost, BRIDGE staff recognized the deep "need" and "value" of doing community building for community building’s sake—not doing it simply to develop a plan or to fulfill a requirement under HOPE SF’s initiative. They recognized the extent and impacts of trauma in the community in which they were working and accepted that decades of disinvestment, broken promises and social problems would take a long time to address and come at a huge expense (or investment). In an interview with Weinstein, she shared, “Essentially we are trying to undo structural racism and that work took a long time to do so it will also take a long time to undo.” BRIDGE also recognized that the investment they are making in community building pays dividends in the end, in terms of improving residents’ well-being and rallying their support for an equitable and sustained redevelopment plan. Acknowledging this huge undertaking, BRIDGE devised a plan to help the community “heal”; to build trust with residents (in and outside of its immediate community), the developer and other partner organizations; to increase their capabilities to engage in decision making and civic processes and to inspire hope for a better future for their individual lives and their community. This is a critical lesson for the field: Practitioners, and importantly funders and policymakers, need to acknowledge the need and value of community building and be patient in realizing impacts. One Potrero Terrace-Annex resident put it as such, “You can rebuild all day long, but if you don’t rebuild the community itself and the people in the community, you’re gonna have the same problems.”
6.2.2. *Being opportunistic with every activity or event involving residents*

Throughout the various projects BRIDGE has engaged in, as well as the programs and activities it has created, it has been incredibly opportunistic in leveraging multiple outcomes with a single activity. This is related to the social-ecological model that it puts forth in its white paper. For example, when planning for the walking club, staff knew that the walking club addressed a common concern among residents (health), was accessible to anyone (no skills required), was personally rewarding (gift card incentive), provided an opportunity for residents to walk and talk to one another, and was a visible sign of unity, positive interactions, change and consistency for the community to see. The walking club also provided a unique (and authentic) opportunity for residents to engage in a pedestrian improvement project, not to mention a space for funders and others who are interested in the Rebuild, to see what is happening, meet residents and learn how they can help. While this is illustrative of one activity, BRIDGE has been able to use this leveraging strategy among its other activities like HGP and Unite Potrero events.

6.2.3. *Understanding how spatial decisions affect engagement*

A critical finding in Potrero Terrace-Annex is how the location of activities influences residents’ participation levels. This came up numerous times in my interviews and reflected in my analysis of BRIDGE’s program data. Many North side residents described how they do not participate in activities that take place within the public housing site. Their rationale largely revolved around safety, in that they fear or still do not feel safe walking alone in the development. On the other hand, both program and interview data confirm how activities or events in more “neutral” areas have higher—and more consistent—participation levels from North and South (non-public housing) side residents. Figure 6.2 contextualizes The NABE, what residents consider a “neutral” place, with the approximate boundaries of the North and South sides and public housing development. This is an important consideration when thinking about fostering North and South side interactions.
6.3 Challenges

6.3.1 Undefined field and extent of trauma

Policymakers and implementers note several key challenges: the community building field does not have a framework, including a process and set of outcomes; the field is not valued in and of itself and the extent of trauma remains significant. Therefore, the capacity needed and the time it takes to have any significant impact are vast.

6.3.2 Modest and time-limited funding

Relating to the previous challenge, because of the vast amount of resources and time it takes to have any impacts, the often modest and time limited funding to do this work is insufficient. The implications of this can involve cutting programs, staff time or incentives, all of which can retrigger trauma in...
residents' lives, damage relationships with planning partners and create mistrust with the planning process.

6.3.3 Sustaining resident and stakeholder engagement

Both BRIDGE staff and HOPE SF partners discussed the challenge of sustaining engagement—or attempting to increase engagement—after six years of planning and without anything physical—"like a crane as a sign that change is coming (Interview with HOPE SF partners). This also relates to the challenge of communicating the urgency of residents' participation in community building activities; despite having significant delays or distant time horizons for when they will actually see results. The same goes for project stakeholders who also may lose faith, patience, or possibly pull out of a project because of significant delays.

6.3.4 Identifying additional "neutral" spaces for TICB activities

At present, the NABE is the only "neutral" place where TICB activities and events take place. And according to Banh, it seems to be at near capacity in terms of trying to lease space for additional days. This raises a question of if the community sees any other spaces in the Hill as "neutral." And, if so, would they be accessible to South side and Potrero Terrace-Annex residents? Does BRIDGE have the financial capacity to lease the space? Is the space fit for the kinds of activities it would want to host?

6.3.5 Measuring impacts

Numerous, significant challenges affect BRIDGE's ability to measure its impacts. The obvious is that the community-building field does not have a generally accepted set of outcomes according to which one can evaluate its work. The second pertains to BRIDGE's existing data system, which is fragmented (i.e., all TICB data are not in one data system) and inconsistent (i.e., activity leaders have varying data fields they collect). Its data system also lacks reliable data from the first few years of planning; therefore, it cannot do any longitudinal analyses (i.e., from 2008-2012). Also, it does not have data on the universe of residents; therefore, it cannot tell how representative its analyses are (i.e., it does not know about non-participants).
6.3.6 Choosing between depth vs. breadth

The question of depth versus breadth is a common implementation challenge, not just among BRIDGE staff, but also across most program administrators and policymakers. Should a program or policy reach a larger population, or go deep with a smaller population? To date, I argue BRIDGE has leaned towards the former—depth—in that its participation data shows a small subset of the universe of Potrero Hill resident participants. While some might argue BRIDGE’s work has not been effectiveness because of its small reach, I would argue that it has been vastly successful for the depth it has been able to achieve with its active participants.

6.4 Recommendations

6.4.1 A sustainable community building plan for Potrero Hill

a. Create an integrated and real-time data system

BRIDGE should invest in creating—whether in-house or through a contract—an integrated, comprehensive and real-time data system. Not only will this allow BRIDGE to understand if and for whom, its TICB activities are effective, but it will allow staff to make mid-course modifications to its programming in real time. It will also allow BRIDGE to more effectively communicate its successes (and needs) to funders and policymakers. While I will not provide an exhaustive list of what the comprehensive data system should capture, some critical data points are the universe of residents in Potrero Terrace-Annex (including participants and non-participants) and all of their demographic information, all TICB participation data (tracking data as far back as they have it), all survey/questionnaire data and other relevant information. Data should be tracked at the individual-level, but also allow for analyses at the household-level. It should also be set up so it can easily be joined with other data through project partnerships and other forms of data sharing agreements. Among many other analyses, this kind of data system would allow BRIDGE staff to analyze how many, and which residents, are participating in activities beyond the threshold of
obtaining a gift card. This could give some insight into resident’s intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivations for TICB activities.

b. Implement a dual-generation case management and service connection system

With the momentum BRIDGE has already begun to establish around a dual-generation community building strategy—namely with HGP—it should consider transitioning into a dual-generation case management and service delivery strategy, like the one being implemented under the Urban Institute’s Housing Opportunity and Services Together (HOST) model and at several public housing sites across the U.S.67

c. Create (or partner with existing providers on) specific activities for middle- and high-school students and college-age young adults

Because of the momentum BRIDGE has created with HGP with children 0-5 through parent-child activities and with elementary-age children with the walking school bus, I think it is critical that BRIDGE develop (or partner with an organization on) specific activities targeted to middle- and high-school students and college-age young adults. Staff can look to Promise Neighborhoods for sites that are doing this work of providing a pipeline of cradle to college services.

d. Utilize the relocation of Daniel Webster to bolster North and South cohesion

With the relocation of Daniel Webster deeper in the North side, staff should create a couple of “bus stops” on the North side as another intentional strategy for bridging the North and South sides of the Hill. BRIDGE should consider hiring a North side CHL and/or soliciting volunteers from the North side to help lead the bus. This can provide further opportunities for residents—both parents and children—from the North and South sides to have regular interactions and

67 See more about the HOST model here: http://www.urban.org/policy-centers/metropolitan-housing-and-communities-policy-center/projects/host-housing-opportunity-and-services-together
opportunities for bonding and working together. Figure 6.2 illustrates the existing walking bus routes with the approximate North and South boundaries.

Figure 6.2 Illustrates the existing walking bus routes with the approximate North and South boundaries.

Source: Bing Maps

Figure 6.3 Walking school bus routes with North and South side boundaries

Source: Bing Maps

e. Extend existing TICB activities to more “neutral” areas and on more mornings/evenings and weekends

To generate more North side participation in activities beyond Zumba and Unite Potrero events, staff should extend the walking club routes to include more parts of the North side and to have at least one morning (before work) or evening (after work) walk. Relatedly, staff should create subsequent community gardens or community murals or host some HGP activities in other “neutral” spaces, so as to foster engagement of North side residents in HGP activities.

f. Institute an annual Unite Potrero activity, like the Community Walk

While BRIDGE discussed the challenges with scaling the community walk to occur annually, based on community feedback, it seems a worthwhile investment. Despite the walk occurring nearly four years from this thesis, many residents, from both the North and South sides, described the tremendous success of it. Many residents felt the activity was educational, fun, and a bonding experience for the broader community to walk their neighborhood together.
Figure 6.4 illustrates the author's estimate path that participants took with approximate boundaries for the North and South sides and the public housing development.

Figure 6.4 Author's estimate route of the community walk with approximate North and South side boundaries
Source Bing Maps

6.4.2 Future research

a. Assess the effectiveness of TICB on social cohesion

BRIDGE staff should administer a post-survey with the same individuals who completed the social cohesion questionnaire distributed at the Resident Get-Togethers late-2010. This will give staff some gauge as to how effective their TICB approach has been. In particular, if the pre- and post-survey data were combined with TICB participation data, staff could determine:

(1) How residents' assessment of social cohesion changed—whether positive or negative—from 2010 to 2015

(2) Who is participating and who is not (based only on survey respondents, not the universe of Potrero Terrace-Annex residents)—and more specifically broken down by race, age, Terrace vs. Annex and the other characteristics asked on the personal background portion of the questionnaire
(3) What participation patterns emerge, broken down by background characteristics and by social cohesion responses

To bolster this work, staff can conduct a random sample of qualitative interviews with survey respondents to tease out the rationale behind their responses and patterns of their participation or non-participation in TICB activities. Staff can also use the interview as an opportunity to ask residents about any barriers to participation and ideas for increasing engagement.

b. Assess TICB during- and post-construction

Because this present research has only examined TICB “pre-construction,” future research should assess TICB “during” and “post-construction.” Contrary to this research, a future study should capture a larger sample size and a random sample from across Potrero Hill. This will provide a more representative set of perspectives about the community building programming and its impact on social interactions—as opposed to this present research, which is of a small and biased sample of perspectives. To better understand my second question about individual and community capacity question, one could consult SFSU’s evaluation, which involved interviews with public housing residents and a larger and diverse set of stakeholder interviews. Finally, I explored the impacts on systems only lightly, so future research could take a broader look at numerous systems—i.e., health, workforce, and transportation among others.

c. TICB at other sites

Finally, because this is the first site that has implemented TICB, further research would be critical in examining its application and impacts in other sites with different contexts—particularly in terms of geography, socio-economic and demographic indicators and project factors such as funding, timeline, construction progress and staffing. Employing a larger sample across multiple sites would provide a more insights into the effects of TICB on the social dynamics of residents of different incomes, tenures and demographic characteristics.
6.5 Conclusion

Decades of years of research have illustrated how social interactions among residents of different economic and social backgrounds in mixed-income developments do not occur “naturally” and the assumption that if we build it [economically-integrated housing, community centers or spaces for integration] community building will happen.

One housing scholar, Mark Joseph, at MIT’s 2013 Planning Practices that Matter symposium, put it this way, “We need to be more Intentional and proactive about building community... developers cannot expect that if they build it, the community will figure it out.” He went on to share how there are several communities across the country that are grasping this and figure it out. Two of those include Cascade Village in Akron, Ohio, where Bill Traynor has engaged a community engagement process that brings residents together in a fun and dynamic way; another is Greenbridge, Seattle, where a Community Builder is assigned to do just that “build community” in the public housing development. I argue—and so did Joseph—that Potrero Terrace-Annex is another community to add to this list. I believe a statement from a Potrero Terrace-Annex resident can summarize the work that BRIDGE has done:

“BRIDGE is teaching people to band together and run their community...empowering people to know, “You can run your community, you have a voice in your community [and] you can stand up for your community.’ That’s what BRIDGE is doing...[T]o bring people together, to motivate people and in a positive and productive way.”
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