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ABSTRACT

This research examines expectations and fears of local residents in light of a proposed waterfront redevelopment project in a diverse urban neighborhood. Before residents were contacted, key leaders and experts throughout the city were briefly interviewed to provide the researcher with a knowledge base from which to formulate survey questions. Residents' expressed a need for information, mixed feelings about the content of the project and some criticism of the city's planning process. These residents were asked to share hopes and concerns about how the new lake might affect their community or quality of life. Interviews also generated suggestions for increased communication and collaboration with city officials. Results of this study will assist community organizations and social workers to better advocate for the estimated 1,600 inner city residents being relocated by the lake area of San Bernardino's "Downtown Revitalization."
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

After years of discussion among city officials, significant investments have been made during the 2001-2002 year to rapidly advance from proposals to concrete plans for a waterfront redevelopment project in the residential urban area of San Bernardino, California. Some city agencies have contributed significant amounts of money towards architectural designs and feasibility studies. Aspects of economics, city image, and water resources have been exhaustively explored but minimal input has come from actual neighborhood residents who will be most affected by the proposed lake.

The public, including these residents, are permitted to attend monthly city council meetings and official public relations meetings. But considering the magnitude of this proposed redevelopment and apparent barriers to civic participation, residents need more than permission to attend meetings, they need to be encouragement and to be equipped with education so they can make informed decisions about relocation. Local residents need an accessible, non-intimidating avenue for expressing
personal needs and priorities for change strategies in their own neighborhood.

This study was an avenue for people from this community to voice their opinions; to share personal hopes and concerns in light of their urban neighborhood, soon to become a lake. They were asked to share their felt needs regarding expected challenges and benefits of the redevelopment. Furthermore, the study identified perceived barriers in communication between the city and the residents. In an effort to support the residents' self-determination of their households and their neighborhood, their feedback will be shared by the researcher with multiple city officials and social services agencies who advocate for and empower vulnerable communities such as this.

Problem Statement

Within the city of San Bernardino, extensive plans are being made for a long-term economic redevelopment project entitled "Downtown Revitalization." In January of 2001 the former "Vision 20/20 Lakes and Streams" project was revised and renamed "Downtown Revitalization." In the near future, ground water will be brought from underneath
the city in the form of a lake in a now urban neighborhood of San Bernardino (see project area map in Appendix A).

A professor at California State University, San Bernardino predicted that "around 5,000 low income renters" would be displaced by the former plan (Precinct Reporter, 2000). The new plan will likely displace 400 households, or 1,600 residents and 30 businesses (T Cook, personal communication, 2002), most of which are low income, Black and Hispanic. The entire project area extends from Baseline Avenue down to Mill Street between the 215 freeway and D Street. In both plans the proposed lake location would be on the southern border of Baseline Avenue. The scope of this study includes only the lake area of the project. The lake area, as defined in this study is from the southern border of Baseline Avenue extending down to 9th Street, between G Street on the west and D Street on the east.

With community support, this extensive project will begin implementation and result in waterfront property surrounded by new shops and businesses. City officials will "acquire" property by offering to purchase homes from residents. If residents refuse to sell, the agency could use their power of "eminent domain" to force the residents to relocate.
When citizens are not included in the planning of their own communities, when it is planned for them, not by them, redevelopment becomes oppressive instead of renewing. Economic Development Agency officials predict they will face significant opposition and future court battles. One staff member at the agency commented on the public's resistance to the "Lakes and Streams" project saying, "I won't see [project] completion in this lifetime...people will sue us and slow down the process." (G. VanOsdel, personal communication, 2001).

The researcher felt that it was important to discover the basis for resistance if indeed local residents were resistant. By asking residents what they know about the project so far, it may be determined if a lack of proactive citizen participation stems from residents believing misinformation, having a lack of information, or hostility towards city government.

**Policy Context**

Each group of stakeholders collaborating in the planning and financing of Downtown Revitalization functions under its own financial, legal, and ethical mandate contributing the planning process. Because this project revolves around redistribution of resources it is by nature a political, social and emotional issue. The
City Council has partnered together with the Municipal Water Company and the local Economic Redevelopment Agency to form a "joint powers authority" (JPA) as a special project committee.

When an Economic Redevelopment Agency claims property for a redevelopment project such as "Downtown Revitalization," federal and state laws require "fair market value" to be paid for each residence intended for demolition or renewal. The agency must also give compensation for the cost of moving and provide three referrals for comparable, affordable alternative housing. Most importantly, they must provide all residents access to documentation and assistance in interpretation of those documents (California Code of Regulations, 2001). There are many guidelines in place to insure that displaced residents receive fair monetary, technical and personal support. Without public education citizens will not be aware of their rights or the services available to them. One stakeholder who has been promoting the project is the San Bernardino Municipal Water District (MUNI). Most experts agree that there is a pressing need to somehow lower underground water levels in the near future. This could be done with huge steel storage tanks or a reservoir lake. Some believe the need to reduce the high ground
water is urgent before a major earthquake to prevent liquefaction damage to buildings. Some residents have expressed concern that MUNI would sell the water to counties like Orange rather than simply storing it. Those residents believe the selling of this water would be foolish and unethical in light of predicted droughts and the assumption that, "The water is a birthright of the people of San Bernardino" (L. Andreasen, President Feldheym Neighborhood Association, personal communication, Friday, October 19, 2001.)

Elected city officials have been strong advocates for the redevelopment project: the city council, Mayor Judith Valles, her office, and Senator Joe Baca. City officials and their hired consultants say the goal of the redevelopment is urban renewal: creating affluent residential and commercial waterfront property out of the existing deteriorated, graffitied, abandoned, and impoverished area. Politicians are promoting the idea that the lake will have many benefits, but some residents are wondering who will truly benefit, and at what cost.

At a public forum sponsored by the Neighborhood Association and Preservation Action Committee, one representative voiced his distrust of local politicians, specifically City Councilwoman Susan Lien of Ward Two in
the lake area. He explained, "The city council person in this room changed her vote! During the election she said 'NO LAKES.' She also told us she was some interior decorator, but she now works for the water company. How can she claim to represent us?"

Due to the magnitude of this redevelopment project, and the distrust to the policy makers, it is imperative for the city to invest time and energy in public relations during the life of this project. By educating its people about the policies and procedures of redevelopment, water resources, and the checks and balances of elected officials, local citizens may receive needed reassurance as well as dignity in being considered stakeholders.

**Practice Context**

At this crucial time in the project planning stages, residents were given the opportunity to participate in this research as an expression of self-determination. In other cities self-determination has taken the form of neighborhood initiative in strategic planning, community meetings and locality development where resident participation improved physical and social neighborhood. The inner city residents of San Bernardino who reside in the proposed lake area of the Downtown Revitalization project, who participated in the study were encouraged to
share honestly how they and their family may be impacted by the new lakefront area.

Findings will be shared with two agencies that wish to use the results of this research for continued advocacy and education with these residents. These agencies have resources, commitment, and report within the city of San Bernardino. They can show continuing support for residents influenced by Downtown Revitalization after this research has been completed. One agency is Inland Congregation United for Change (ICUC). It represents over 35 local faith-based congregations and 30,000 families; which consist of a diverse and influential group in San Bernardino. The staff of ICUC has expressed eagerness to actively address this issue by organizing residents, empowering them and advocating for their needs. The other agency is Neighborhood Housing Services. This agency will be the mediator between residents and the Economic Development Agency so that relocation benefits are granted appropriately. Neighborhood Housing Services values the dignity of individuals and is committed to meeting holistic needs in the relocation process.
Purpose of the Study

This proactive, community practice social work research was a preliminary needs assessment of residents' quality of life and level of current civic participation in the midst of significant change. Research results were given as recommendations to two significant social service agencies near the project area. These agencies are in positions of power to promote education or advocacy as appropriate as follow-up to this research.

This research gave residents in the affected area a chance to voice opinions regarding the proposed lake in their neighborhood. Through personal interviews, local residents had the opportunity to exchange information, ask questions, and develop a plan for greater civic involvement in planning and implementation of "Downtown Revitalization."

To date, community involvement has been minimal at public hearings. One citizen who attended the October 9th, 2001 City Council meeting made his disapproval of the planning process clear by saying, "People will be displaced...bring this to a vote, let the people decide!" The few residents who do attend meetings have made clear their distrust of city officials; specifically that they do not feel representation or respect from those on the
Joint Powers Authority committee. One concerned citizen shared her concern that city officials are acting out of motivation for greed..."making San Bernardino water available to other cities for financial gain while lying to residents here about the real reason for Lakes and Streams."

The residents themselves defined the issues studied by this research. It was these residents who defined priorities for neighborhood redevelopment as well as proposed possible solutions for increased community-government cooperation in the planning process.

Significance of the Project for Social Work

The estimated 1,600 people facing relocation live in a "blighted" area. They can be considered a vulnerable group because they are in a low socio-economic neighborhood where crime rates are high. Eighty percent of them are renters (T. Cook, personal communication, 2001) and many speak Spanish. Relocation may cause severe hardship for the poor, if they are not aware of its policies and procedures. They may unknowingly forfeit all compensation by moving before they receive "fair market value" from the city agency. They may have limited choices
for a new property if they have special needs, especially when affordable housing is scarce. Displaced elderly must abandon long-established social networks. Elderly renters are likely to suffer most. "One may be able to grow new roots in another community, but frequently relocation results in weaker roots, and each move may be painful, especially at a later stage in life (Rothman, 200, Downs, 1981).

It is the role of social workers to educate, empower and advocate for these citizens. If the proposed redevelopment accomplishes its goals of increasing quality of life, beautifying the community and renewing the neighborhood, those who have been relocated will not live in the area to reap the benefits. Crime may go down and jobs be created but that will be enjoyed by new residents who can afford to own lakefront property.

Neighborhood development and community organizing are ways social workers can promote change on a macro level. The social worker can utilize his/her competence and cultural sensitivity by identifying stakeholders with varying amounts of power. In the interest of social justice, social workers should encourage civic participation among people, especially in lower economic
areas as a way to value residents’ self-determination and dignity.

This qualitative research is an example of how relevant macro practice skills can be utilized in the local community for the benefit of a vulnerable group in a meaningful way. When doing social work with communities, many of the same skills are used as when working with individuals and groups. The client should define felt needs, set and prioritize goals, have ownership, and suggest solutions to increase the quality of their life in their environment. In earning trust and building a relationship with resistant or apathetic communities, it is helpful to have a community grandparent or guide advocating for you, so that you can get to a place where you can bring appropriate resources to those who need it most.

Findings of this study allowed ICUC and Neighborhood Housing Services to gain a knowledge base from which to advocate for these San Bernardino residents in a strategic and insightful way during future years of project implementation.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

When communities face redevelopment, research has shown that community participation is necessary and ethical. A lack of coordination and communication could slow development or threaten long-term viability of a project. One’s quality of life is directly affected by one’s environment, especially when there is change. This literature review discusses common issues regarding civic participation in urban redevelopment. Other information was gathered through conversations with various city officials in San Bernardino, many of whom are considered to be experts on the "Downtown Revitalization" redevelopment. (Appendix B lists these individuals.)

Human Behavior in the Social Environment Theories Guiding Conceptualization

Community members should be involved from the early stages of planning and throughout the implementation of the project so that they have mutual ownership and are considered a stakeholder. Residents themselves should be consulted during the design process to see what features bother them most and what improvements they would consider
acceptable (Downs, 1981). This acknowledges the dignity of the individual and preserves quality of life. Quality of life is impacted by urban renewal because the environment influences the individual.

Since the 1960’s much has been said about the social impact accompanying urban neighborhood renewal. Proactive measures need to be taken to prevent San Bernardino from facing a tragedy like the fictional scenario illustrated in “Rebuilding the Inner City,” where city planners, “intent on demonstrating that neighborhoods had outlived their usefulness, ignored evidence of community life, not realizing they were complex, made up of thousands of relationships, interactions, and interconnection that took decades to build. So they bulldozed and destroyed.” (Halpern, 1995). Some citizens assume redevelopment is by nature this oppressive.

Two theories of practice strive to prevent this type of oppression in communities. Both of these theories affirm that the greatest asset a community has is its people. They assert the power of average citizens in influencing the process and outcome of community change.

Community development (otherwise known as “locality development”) may be characterized by encouraging as many members to be involved as possible and emphasizing
cooperation with authorities regarding a particular project. Community organizing is a further stage of empowerment, focusing on long-term community wellness. It gets issues from resident members, and may involve confrontation with authorities (World Vision International, 1989). One principle that is considered the "Iron rule" of organizing is, "never do for people what they can do for themselves" (Cortes, 1987) Successful community/locality development and organizing enlists community members with their array of interests and abilities to join together for self-advocacy and leadership.

Randy Stoecker, Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work at the University of Toledo in Ohio, points out that "it may be better for communities to organize to direct redevelopment rather than do redevelopment." He believes communities can organize to set priorities on what development they want first through engaging in a comprehensive community-based planning process. Furthermore, this approach "builds community unity and is not bound by financial, bureaucratic, and political constraints."

People and their city officials who are informed of legal and ethical relocation rights, the policies and
procedures of redevelopment and identify with the community are best equipped to make wise decisions setting priorities for project planning, design, and implementation process.

Civic Participation

Many scholars, economic developers, and neighborhood associations emphasize collaboration in urban planning calling for a collaboration of citizens, elected officials, and expert planners. The public’s response and participation in planning predicts their attachment and utilization of the newly developed area; that will allow a project to live or die (Torre, 1989).

Whether they know they have power or not, local citizens have the right to bring forth petition signatures calling for a public vote on a redevelopment project when they disagree with city planning. This is one example of action that could be taken if residents were informed about their rights. The California Code of Regulations says the public entity initiating relocation (in this case the Economic Redevelopment Agency,) “shall encourage residents and community organizations in the displacement area to form a relocation committee.” Furthermore, “when possible this committee should include residential owner
occupants, residential tenants, business people, and members of existing organizations within the area. Section 6012 on citizen participation states, "all persons who will be displaced, neighborhood groups, and any relocation committee, shall be given an opportunity and should be encouraged fully and meaningfully to participate in reviewing the relocation plan and monitoring the relocation assistance program" (California Code of Regulations, 2001). Experts agree that citizen participation is valuable; local citizens should be free to hold positions of power in decision-making.

Contrary to public opinion in San Bernardino, this author also claims, "waterfront development is fortunately an emotional issue for which a consensus can easily be established" (Torre, 1989). In San Bernardino residents may agree more so with Mark Twain's perspective on water, "Whiskey is for drinkin', and water is for fightin' over." Even with strong differences of opinion community members' ideas are at least as important as those of the professionals involved. Consulting them may mollify some of their resistance toward the change (Downs, 1981). Some cities have found innovative ways to encourage participation such as in Baltimore where the city makes financial and technical assistance available so
neighborhood organizations can more effectively cooperate with city administrators in the planning process (Downs, 1981). In another city, the city of Austin, Texas citizen participation was valued while planning the urban waterfront project, Towne Lake. Residents' needs, aspirations, and visions were considered through an exhaustive public participation process including formal meetings, forums, hundreds of interviews, and the establishment of Towne Lake Waterfront center. Until project completion in 1987, the public could go to the center to "monitor the ongoing status of the project, ask questions and receive current maps of the project area" (Torre, 1989). These innovative ideas that foster participation may be strategies San Bernardino can utilize

Residents' Rights
Local citizens have the right to bring forth petition signatures to call for a public vote on a redevelopment project issue when they disagree with city planning (US Department of Housing, 1995). This is one example of action that could be taken if citizens were aware of their rights. The California Code of Regulations as well as the US Department of Housing and Urban Development describe in detail assistance that is given to individuals and
families, renters and homeowners when displaced and relocated (see Appendix C). Assistance is also promised in the form of counseling and referrals to minimize the impact of the move as well as legal advocacy assistance in the case of discriminatory practices on the part of real-estate agents, lenders, rental agents or property owners. Because the United States government has decided that no more than 30% of one’s income should have to go towards housing expenses, relocated families will receive financial compensation for up to 42 or 60 months when their new housing costs more than 30%. For example, “If a family’s adjusted monthly income is $600 and monthly rent with utilities in the replacement home is $350, the monthly assistance would be $170 (30 percent of $600). Over 60 months the family receives $10,200 in rental assistance.” (G. VanOsdel, personal communication, 2001 and Department of Housing, 1995.)

Summary

The literature reviewed illustrated the significance of public enthusiasm over local redevelopment. Participatory democracy facilitates resident’s dignity when relocation is necessary. It is the poor, the elderly and long-term residents that often pay the greatest social
cost. Financial compensation can be generous, especially for low-income renters who pay more than 30% of their income toward housing before relocation (US Department of Housing). Partnership and innovative community participation can preserve the individual's quality of life during economic urban renewal.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

Chapter Three documents the steps used in soliciting participant involvement and collecting data. It explains attempts made to recruit focus group members and the alternative method of doing one-on-one interviews. Chapter Three describes the role of the researcher as an interviewer and the task of Spanish translators and volunteer community guides who made possible the inclusion of Spanish speaking participants. The open-ended questions that were used to encourage participants’ expression of felt needs and possible solutions are explained. The interview guide and the way in which qualitative data were organized into categories are discussed.

Study Design

In January, the revised lake area of the “Downtown Revitalization” project was surveyed and mapped for possible focus group locations accessible to local residents. Five churches, 2 recreational facilities and 1 social service agency were identified within the designated lake region of the redevelopment area. (See Appendix D.) Contact was made with the pastor or director
of each of these organizations. Some of these pastors were willing to donate the use of their facility for focus groups but all five reported that none of their church members were residents of the redevelopment project lake area. Other reasons church leaders gave for choosing not to participate was because they “did not want to get politically involved.” By March, when it became evident that it would be impossible to recruit focus groups from local congregations, the researcher selected the method of door-to-door interviews within the same lake project boundaries. Twenty of these interviews were conducted with current residents in the proposed lake area of the Downtown Revitalization redevelopment project.

Face-to-face interviews allowed residents to freely express hopes and concerns about the lake’s future impact on their lives in an environment that was as natural as possible to allow everyday conversation. It encouraged residents to be more candid and outspoken than they might be in a more intimidating context such as a city council meeting. Participants were not inconvenienced by being asked to travel to an unfamiliar location or to give up much of their time. Open-ended questions solicited felt needs and suggestions for greater community involvement in collaboration with city officials. Bilingual students from
the nearby Youth Build academic program were selected to accompany the researcher for the interviews. These students live in or near the project area and were familiar with the culture of poverty and diversity. They exhibited cultural sensitivity, insight, and language skills that enabled the researcher to be successful and better received as an outsider to this particular community. The Youth Build students served as Spanish translators, and cultural guides in the neighborhood.

Sampling

The study subjects were selected based on their place of residency, willingness, and if they reported to be 18 years of age or older. These were the community members who reside in the proposed lake area of Downtown Revitalization. Only residents living between Baseline Avenue, D Street, 9th Street and G Street in the city of San Bernardino were eligible. At least one community member from each neighborhood block and apartment complex was contacted. The researcher made certain that the participants reflected the diversity of the neighborhood including Black, Hispanic, and White, and both English and Spanish speaking. Residents who were home at the time of the interviews and answered their doors or who were
outdoors were invited to participate. Interviews were conducted over a 3-week span during a variety of morning, afternoon, and weekend hours. An incentive of an $8.00 gift certificate to Inland Center Mall per person was offered. Interviews were conducted in Spanish or English as preferred.

Data Collection and Instruments

The interview guide was made up of 18 questions. Questions covered demographic information, residents' familiarity with the project, pros and cons of redevelopment, and suggestions for collaboration with city officials in the planning and implementation of Downtown Revitalization. Residents were asked to share both hopes and concerns of how their household and community will be changed. The researcher, the translator and the cultural guide remained as unbiased as possible by taking a written report of responses given and asking clarifying questions, so that data accurately reflected participants' feedback. Most of the questions were open-ended. (Refer to Appendix E to view the complete Interview Guide in English and Spanish.)

Gender was not asked as a question since it was obvious upon meeting the interviewee. Participants were
first asked how long they had been living in their current dwelling. This question served as a conversation starter. The interviewer then inquired as to whether they were renting or own that home or apartment.

Three questions were asked as multiple-choice questions using a 5-point Likert Scale, with 1 being strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree. These questions measured by this scale were: "Are you familiar with the city's redevelopment project plan for this neighborhood?," "Would you be willing to relocate to another home for the sake of the project?," and "Do you think a lake in this neighborhood would be good for the city of San Bernardino?"

Each participant was asked how familiar they were with the "city's redevelopment plan for their neighborhood formerly called Vision 20/20 Lakes and Streams, now called 'Downtown Revitalization'." (It was important to use both names since the project had been referred by the original name for several years, and was changed only 4 months before the time of the interview.) If they asked for more clarification, or seemed hesitant, the question was reworded, "from what you know, how would you describe the project? This was to determine whether they did actually know about the project, to what extent, and to see if what
they thought they knew was actually truthful information. If the person reported knowing nothing about the project or said they had never heard of the project, they were shown Bulletin #4 which was mailed out March, 2002 by the city's Public Relations consultant, the Robert Group to every household in the project area. This bulletin includes a drawing of proposed redevelopment. If the individual agreed they were familiar with the project or were not sure, they were then asked the source or sources of information. They were asked if they heard about the project from “neighbors, newspaper, TV”. (i.e., the news or City Council meetings), public meetings or the city web site. Later, “friends and family” were added to the neighbor category. They were asked what kind of information they thought would be useful with a series of multiple choices. By keeping these questions specific, it should be clear what follow-up is needed, what types of information that they felt need for.

Procedures

During the months of April and May the researcher accompanied by the translators and a community guide, walked street by street through the project area. In groups of 2 or 3, they approached community members who
were outdoors, and knocked on doors of homes and apartments. If the individual looked Hispanic, the Hispanic translator initiated conversation and introduced himself and the research topic. If the individual appeared to be Black or White, the White researcher or the Black or Hispanic cultural guide initiated conversation in an effort to be culturally sensitive and most naturally build report with the potential participant. The language of preference was determined before any interview questions were asked. If the individual seemed to have any difficulty reading the Informed Consent, the researcher or translator read it to them. Once the individual gave consent to continue, they were awarded the gift certificate.

For residents who were not familiar with the redevelopment project, they were shown a copy of the latest community newsletter sent out by the city and a current map of the project area. The researcher asked each interview question and translators assisted as needed. Interviews ranged in time from about 10 minutes to about 25 minutes depending on the interest of the individual. All interviews were conducted on the sidewalk, yard or front doorway of the resident's home or apartment during daylight hours for personal safety. The researcher and
translator asked questions for clarification and to accurately record answers. Finally, participants were invited to give any additional comments or suggestions at the end of the interview.

Protection of Human Subjects

During the interview, the researcher, translator and cultural guide introduced themselves by name, but never requested the name of the residents. Once data were collected, numbers were assigned to each case for data analysis. No participant names were used. Participants were asked to read an Informed Consent sheet before they agreed to be interviewed. (See Appendix F.) Before residents were asked to participate, permission was granted in writing by marking an 'X' on the Informed Consent sheet with the date of the interview. They were told that they could stop at any time during the study. At the end of the interview each participant was given a Debriefing sheet with the name of the researcher and faculty advisor along with a phone number if they had any follow-up questions concerning the study. The Debriefing sheet also listed names, phone numbers and a website where updated information on Downtown Revitalization can be found. (See Appendix G.)
Data Analysis

Twenty-one interviews were completed, although one of these had so many incomplete answers, it was eliminated from data analysis. Seven other residents declined to participate. Data were collected regarding demographic information, residents' familiarity with the project, housing issues, opinions about redevelopment in the neighborhood, and suggestions for collaboration with city officials for the planning and implementation of Downtown Revitalization. Qualitative data were organized into measurable categories. (See the Code Book in Appendix H.)

Data from all 20 cases were analyzed using SPSS 10.0 with descriptive statistics and some chi-squared comparisons of groups.

Participants indicated how familiar they were with the Downtown Revitalization project. Their responses were categorized in three ways: accurate information, inaccurate information, and no information known. After having had so many conversations with city officials, researching the topic and attending public meetings on the issue, the researcher felt competent to make this determination.
The type of information requested by help local residents feel more included in the planning process would be information about redevelopment, relocation rights and benefits, a current map of the project area, and times for city meetings. These terms were explained if the residents seemed unclear. They could select all that applied.

One of the housing issues discussed was the length of time the resident resided in the neighborhood, grouped into 4 categories: up to 1 year, 1-5 years, 6-15 years, or 16 to 30 years. Residents described their willingness to move for the sake of the project on a five-point Likert Scale, 1 being strongly agree, 5 being strongly disagree. Later this five-point scale was collapsed into 2 categories of “agree” or “disagree” with those who reported being “not sure” put into the “agree” category. It was assumed that those who were “not sure” would agree once they received more information about relocation benefits. Homeowners and renters were asked where they would plan to move if asked to relocate. This was asked as an open ended question, when asked, but made into three categories of “in San Bernardino”, “out of San Bernardino”, or “not sure.”

The many opinions and suggestions of residents were analyzed based on whether the comments were pros or cons
of redevelopment. Individuals were asked to predict how their daily life might be affected once homes in the neighborhood became a lake area. The types of responses they gave were organized into four categories: transportation issues (such as changed bus routes or having to commute farther), financial burden (such as moving costs or new rent payments), educational concerns (such as wanting to continue attending a particular school or having to drop out), and employment.

When specifically asked to name inconveniences or challenges caused by the redevelopment, residents gave responses that were related to either "construction during implementation" or the "hassle of moving." When asked specifically to name new benefits or new opportunities due to the redevelopment, a wide variety of responses were given. These were organized into categories including tourism, recreation for families and children, to beautification, and an improved economy, specifically with the creation of new jobs.

Individuals were asked if they could think of new suggestions for, "ways you or your neighbors could partner with city officials." Due to the wide variety of suggestions given, these responses were put into categories that reflect the attitude of the participant:
“show of opposition to the city,” “show of support for the city,” “the need for capacity building,” and “the need for public education or better communication” between the city and residents in the project area.

Summary

Methods used in data collection and in analysis were planned with consideration for the individual’s right to self-determination. The interviewer came into the community of the residents to overcome accessibility issues. The face-to-face interviews were conducted using an interview guide with many open-ended questions. Responses to questions were categorized post hoc, to reflect residents’ main concerns, suggestions, and points of view.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter four reports demographic information for the participants and what they had to say about their neighborhood and its redevelopment plan. These qualitative and quantitative data showed that many residents were not familiar with the redevelopment plan for their community. Although residents had mixed feelings about the potential success of a new lakefront area, many reported concerns about various social consequences foreseen.

Presentation of the Findings

Demographics

Of the residents in the project area who participated in the study, 35% were male and 65% female. All participants spoke either Spanish or English. Of those interviewed, 65% spoke English (or were bilingual) and 35% spoke only Spanish. Interviews done during weekday day hours were mostly with women at home with small children. Some of these women, even if they had no idea what the redevelopment project was about, were especially hospitable and friendly, even inviting the researcher and the translator to come indoors for the interview.
Interviews conducted during evening or weekend hours were more likely to be with men, some of whom used profanity, expressing anger or embarrassment about neighborhood problems.

Table 1. Demographics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at Home or Apartment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0-1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6-15)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16+)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Ownership Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Issues**

In many ways this community does reflect physical blight. It is not uncommon to see homes boarded up and vacant. None of the participants were homeless; all reported to be renting or to own a home or apartment. Among the relatively small sample, 65% said they were
renting, similar to the estimated 70% suggested by the project manager in the Mayor's office (T. Cook, personal communication, 2001).

The question, "Are you willing to relocate for the sake of the project?" was did not a productive question. Almost every person answered this favorably, agreeing to relocate, but most added a comment like, "What do you mean willing? We don't have a choice." Of the few who said they were not willing to move, it made no significant difference whether they were renters or owners. However, every resident who reported to have lived in the neighborhood for 1 year or less, said they were willing to relocate. With a larger sample size, this may have proved to be significant.

Some said their decision to relocate would be based on proximity to their place of employment, to their family or their current school. Other important considerations would be affordability of housing or preferring to live in a nicer, safer neighborhood. Priorities in the decision of where to relocate included a nicer, safer neighborhood, affordability of housing, proximity to work and proximity to family or school, in that order. One resident expressed desire for his/her special needs child to remain in the same school. "My child needs to stay at this school where
teachers know him/her." Twenty percent of all interviewed expressed concerns about housing; some made it clear they want to continue to live in a house, not an apartment, while others worried about finding any comparable housing nearby. Sixty-five percent plan to stay in San Bernardino, whereas 35% plan to relocate outside the city.

Residents' Familiarity with Project

Not one person reported their source of information was "television" or the city's web site. Only one person claimed to receive their information first hand through a city council meeting, but the majority (65% of those interviewed) received their information about the project from word of mouth via neighbors, friends or family. Thirty percent of those interviewed said they are informed through the newspaper. There was no significant difference in the source of information between English and Spanish speaking groups of residents.

Only 45% of the participants gave an accurate statement when describing the redevelopment project, while 20% gave an inaccurate description, and 35% knew no information. Examples of accurate responses given were: "people are going to have to move," "there will be a smaller lake," "wells are already in," "they're trying to make San Bernardino a better place by bringing in rich
homes and shops," and "they have been sending out those flyers with maps telling us we'll get 'fair value.'" All of these are accurate and current information about Downtown Revitalization. Some examples of responses that were considered inaccurate information were as follow: "the lake will be from Muscoy all the way to Sierra," (which is several miles larger than the actual proposed lake,) "It's an Orange County water project," (which the water company has denied), and "there's gunna be some streams and rivers" (the new project plan has only one significant lake and 2 small lakes.)

Residents were quick to request types of information that would make them feel more involved in the planning process. Many asked for more than one kind of information. Seventy percent requested information about relocation rights and benefits. Forty percent requested information on general redevelopment, 40% said they would like a current map of the project area, and 30% would like to know about times and locations for meetings or forums. Each interviewee asked for at least one type of information regarding "Downtown Revitalization."
Residents' Opinions

Residents predicted aspects of their own daily life would be affected most because they expect relocation to cause financial burden, or means they would have to drop out or change schools. Half of all participants said they, "did not know how daily life would be affected," or "would not be affected in any way." When asked if a lakefront area would be good for the city of San Bernardino, 50% agreed and the other 50% either did not know or did not agree. (See Appendix I.)

When they shared specific expectations of how redevelopment would affect the community, many mentioned examples of neighbors they knew whom they consider to be vulnerable in some way. Concerns included poor neighbors being displaced or possibly becoming homeless, elderly neighbors being inconvenienced, the loss of historical structures, the loss of San Bernardino water (assuming the lake water would be sold to other cities), and existing small, Hispanic businesses affected (put out of business, unable to compete with new commercial business or helped by new tourism to the area). In particular, 21% expressed concern for the poor, 21% expressed concern for elders and 42% either did not know how the community would be affected or did not think it would be affected. The
remaining interviews mentioned local small business owners and historical buildings that would be torn down. One homeowner expressed his view on social justice by saying “people shouldn’t be kicked out because they can’t afford to bring their house up to code.”

Of the 20 residents interviewed, 30% believe they would be inconvenienced by the project due to the hassle of moving. Fifteen percent expected inconveniences from actual construction, and 55% could not or did not explain how they will be inconvenienced or challenged by the redevelopment. On the other hand, residents could imagine a wide range of benefits or new opportunities from the redevelopment. Thirty percent expect new recreational opportunities for families or children, 25% expect a better economy with new jobs, 15% look forward to the beautification of the area, and 30% could not or did not expect any new benefits or opportunities due to Downtown Revitalization in their area.

When invited to share a comment with city official, 55.6% expressed comments of empathy or support toward city. Some of the empathetic comments were optimistic, such as, “I wish them [the city] luck. It is hard to get people off the streets to spend time with family.” Others were hopelessness and made comments like, “Look around.
The problem is too big; they'll never change San Bernardino." Whereas 22.2% expressed criticism of the planning process, another 22% expressed criticism of the project itself. Those who criticized the project make comments like, "tear down houses if you have to, but bring us jobs, not a lake."

Summary

Half of the residents could not imagine how daily life would be affected by the redevelopment. Many expressed a need for more information. Local residents could think of many new benefits a lakefront area would bring to the community to increase quality of life or the beauty of the community, but they also gave very specific examples of the social cost of urban redevelopment.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the implications of the results and explain the limitations of this study. It will draw conclusions from the results while discussing existing trends and recommendations for future research and community organizing.

Discussion

In light of the responses residents have given, the lack of basic information related to the proposed lake project was evident. Only 45% of those interviewed reported accurate information about the project! For the most part, lack of detailed information hindered residents from responding to every question. The greatest need for these homeowners and renters is to be informed and included.

Local residents do not know when they must move, if they must move, how they would move, or why the city has chosen their neighborhood for this project. This means many residents never received a City Bulletin in the mail, or even heard of the project. Not one person reported their source of information as having come from city
council meetings or the city's web site. This is alarming since these two places are the richest sources of information regarding Downtown Revitalization. It can be concluded that their lack of civic participation to date, is not due to apathy, but lack of knowledge. Not one person said they did not need further information, or did not care to know more about the local redevelopment. Specifically, these people would like information about relocation rights and benefits, redevelopment in general, and current maps of the exact project area.

In looking at costs and benefits of having a lakefront area, residents could think of many benefits. They seemed to think that benefits such as recreation, beautification, and a better economy with more jobs were important and needed in the community. Social costs, however, were also mentioned regarding significant issues such as social justice and oppression. Their concerns are real. They know that their next-door neighbor has a limited income or is elderly with no family. These concerns are not uncommon, and not invalid. They need to be addressed by city planners and public relations consultants.

If the waterfront dream becomes a reality, it may end up being an upper-class island in the midst of a
relatively poor city, an emerging island of upscale Starbucks, cafes and condos, luring in affluent businesses, and raising property values. While this may provide the city with needed recreation and new jobs, the 1,600 current residents being relocated to other ends of the city (or other cities) will not directly benefit from the lake. They would need to find available and affordable transportation to the lake from their new residence, and be able to afford to dine at such establishments.

Rather than relocating residents far away from the neighborhood, city officials may want to consider helping residents relocate to homes and apartments within walking distance of the lake area or accommodate these residents in future low-income, lakefront housing. Residents want to know how the lake will directly benefit them and families they know. They also have housing concerns and want to know more about how redevelopment works. Justice might be better served if they were given the opportunity to invest in and live in the redeveloped lakefront community, rather than be replaced by wealthier counterparts.

Limitations
The scope of this research was limited by its small sample size. If a larger number of residents could have
been interviewed, the results would have been more representative of the population of residents from the proposed lake area. By gathering residents together in focus groups rather than individual interviews, residents would have likely given more input and suggestions for strategic ways the community could better collaborate with city officials on Downtown Revitalization. Community focus groups may have also given residents a greater sense of empowerment and civic involvement needed for future community organizing.

Residents who were interviewed were those residents who were at home and both willing and able to answer their front door. There could have been elderly residents for example, who were unable or unwilling to answer the knock at the door and therefore did not participate.

Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research

Citizens in all redevelopment areas need to be encouraged to participate in the project planning process. Now is the time for fact gathering, public education regarding rights and policies for redevelopment and relocation benefits. The first step towards capacity building in this neighborhood is to create a regular means of communication. Besides going door-to-door, possible
places for community education and recruitment in this neighborhood are described as "selected organizations in the proposed lake area" listed as Appendix D. These are frequented places such as corner markets in the area where locals can be found and people may be comfortable gathering. The church buildings and recreational facilities listed may be good locations to hold community meetings or to offer support to a citizen advisory committee as described in the Literature Review, Civic Participation section.

Citizens need to be empowered with information to voice their opinions, fears, and suggestions. With leadership from agencies like Inland Congregations United for Change and Neighborhood Housing Services, local people can form consensus, set priorities, and advocate for themselves and their neighborhood. By considering residents' felt needs and empowering them in the decision making process, it would be possible for San Bernardino's "Downtown Revitalization" redevelopment project to preserve and enhance quality of life in this urban neighborhood.

Jack Rothman says locality development "empowers local residents to gain capacity to solve problems and successfully cope with powerful authorities and
institutions that affect their lives" (Rothman, 2001). Local residents are capable of being this successful in San Bernardino with the leadership catalyst of community minded social workers. Collaborations will be the key. Residents must be willing to partner with government or community organizations to get what they need in order to make informed decisions about relocation and community renewal. Social workers need to collaborate with others to have an interdisciplinary scope in assessing the quality of life of San Bernardino residents in relation to economics, environment, health, housing and education.

Conclusions

Because the current greatest source of information on "Downtown Revitalization" is by word of mouth, city officials need to have a physical presence in this neighborhood to answer questions and share vision of the project. It is in the best interest of the city to be in conversation with these residents, whom they have been elected to serve.

Residents need to know exactly what "Downtown Revitalization" will be replacing and creating. They want to know "what, where, when, why and how" it will bring change in their daily lives. Public education and open
communication should be the next step. These residents need to be actively recruited to participate on a relocation committee during the life of the project. By having residents in positions of leadership such as this committee, they will not only be aware of their rights and responsibilities, they will also be able to assist social service agencies to appropriately distribute resources and compensation to those who have the greatest need.
APPENDIX A

MAP OF DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA
APPENDIX B
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT: RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS
Relocation rights include, but are not limited to...

- 90 day notice to residents for vacating

- financial compensation considered "fair market value" for the property and home.

- the right to sue in court to challenge the Economic Redevelopment Agency's claim of "eminent domain."

- at least 3 referrals to available comparable housing, and transportation for resident to inspect those options.

- interim living costs

- compensation for all moving costs

- "descent, safe, sanitary" replacement housing with accessibility to place of employment, public and commercial facilities, equal or better to those near previous dwelling

- financial compensation for disconnecting and reconnecting utility fees

- referrals to appropriate public and private agencies that provide services concerning housing financing, employment, health, welfare or legal assistance (in order to minimize the impact of the move).

NOTE: Receipts are necessary for compensation.
Resident must be a U.S. citizen to receive relocation benefits
APPENDIX C

LIST OF KEY CITY LEADERS
These individuals and offices were contacted by the researcher before any residents were interviewed, to gain foundational knowledge regarding general redevelopment, Downtown Revitalization and the community of San Bernardino.

Community University Partnership.
909.880.5000
Director, Rick Eberst

Economic Redevelopment Agency, City of San Bernardino.
909.663.1044
Director, Gary Van Osdel

Feldheym Neighborhood Action Preservation Committee.
909.383.9203
Director, Lillice Andreason

Inland Congregations United For Change.
909.383-1134.
Director, Kelvin Simmons

Mayor Judith Valles' Office, the City of San Bernardino.
909.394.5133
Project Manager, Tim Cook
Community Liaison, Nick Gonzales

Municipal Water District of San Bernardino.
909.384.5558.
Community Liaison, Russell Smith

Neighborhood Housing Services.
909.884-6891.
Director, Dawkins Hodges

The Robert Group.
213.381.5700
Public Relations Consultant, Clarissa Filiguon

Youth Build.
909.383.1657
Director, Dwight Rodgers

Note: Underline indicates those agencies doing follow-up to this research
APPENDIX D

SELECTED ORGANIZATIONS IN PROPOSED LAKE AREA
LOCAL CHURCHES:
Holy Land Church of God in Christ, Pastor Lenior.
909.820.9674 / 909.381.2662. 1024 N ‘G’ St
(building will be preserved)

Vietnamese Evangelical Church,
909.888.9999. 1153 N ‘F’ St
(building might be acquired)

Primera Iglesia Bautista
909.384.9432. 901 N ‘F’ St
(building will be acquired for project)

1st Church of Christ Scientist, Board of Directors
909.889.3418. 736 N ‘E’ St
(building will be preserved as Historical building)

New Beginning Christian Church, Pastor Ken Fowler
909.885.6587. 718 N ‘F’ St
(building might be acquired, pastor hopes it remains)

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES:
Campfire Boys/Girls Club
909.885.6521. 1126 N ‘E’ St
(building will be preserved as Historical building)

Alana Social Club, Director, Katie
909.885.9643. 449 10th St at Stoddard.

SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY IN PROJECT AREA
Youth Build, Dwight Rodgers Director
909.383.1657, 1139 N ‘E’ St
(building will be acquired for project)

POSSIBLE SITES FOR FUTURE COMMUNITY EDUCATION / OUTREACH:
-Manna Market. ‘D’ St
-E St Market. Baseline Ave at ‘E’ St.
-Bob’s Market. ‘H’ St at 10th Midway

NOTE: All organizations are located within only the lake area of the total Downtown Redevelopment project area
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW GUIDE IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH
1.) What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

2.) What language do you understand best?
   Spanish
   English
   other _______________________

3.) How long have you lived in your current residence?
   Less than 1 year
   1 - 5 years
   6 - 15 years
   16 - 30 years
   more than 30 years

4.) Do you currently....
   rent
   own
   other _______________________

5.) I am familiar with the city's redevelopment project plan for this neighborhood.
   (formerly called "Vision 20/20 Lakes & Streams", now called "Downtown Revitalization")
   strongly disagree disagree not sure agree strongly agree
   5  4  3  2  1

6.) What is your source of information regarding this redevelopment project?
   (mark all that apply)
   neighbors
   newspaper
   TV
   city council meetings
   San Bernardino City web site
   Other _______________________

7.) What do you know about the "Downtown Revitalization" project?
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

8.) Do you think a lake in this neighborhood would be good for the city of San Bernardino?
19.) How do you think this redevelopment will affect your daily life? (job, quality of life, housing)
________________________________________________________________________

10.) How might this community as a whole be affected by this new lake and waterfront area?
________________________________________________________________________

11.) In what ways might this redevelopment cause you inconveniences or challenges?
________________________________________________________________________

12.) In what ways might the redevelopment bring you new opportunities or benefits?
________________________________________________________________________

13.) I would be willing to relocate to another home for the sake for the project.
strongly disagree disagree not sure agree strongly agree
5 4 3 2 1

14.) If asked to relocate, what would be most important to you in making that decision?
________________________________________________________________________

15.) If you were asked to relocate, where would you move?
________________________________________________________________________

16.) What kind of information would make you feel more involved in the project?
☐ information about redevelopment ☐ public meeting times
☐ current maps of the project area ☐ your rights if asked to move
☐ other ______________________

17.) What are some new ways you or your neighbors could work together with city officials?
________________________________________________________________________
18.) What would you like to say to city officials about redevelopment your neighborhood?

19.) Other Comments:

Thank you
1.) ¿Cual es su sexo?
   Hombre
   Mujer

2.) ¿Cual idioma entiende mejor?
   Español
   Ingles
   otra _________________________________

3.) ¿Por cuantos años ha vivido en su residencia?
   Menos de 1 año
   1 - 5 años
   6 - 15 años
   16 - 30 años
   mas de 30 años

4.) Actualmente usted....
   paga renta
   es dueño (a)
   otro _________________________________

5.) Conozces el plan del proyecto de la reurbanización de la ciudad para este comunidad.
   (Anteriormente se llamó "Visión 20/20 Lagos y Ríos")
   no lo conozco para nada no conozco no se si lo conozco si lo conozco bien
   5 4 3 2 1

6.) ¿Cómo conoce el proyecto de reurbanización? (tache todos que apliquen)
   vecinos
   periódico
   televisión
   junto del consejo municipal
   sitio del red, San Bernardo
   otro _________________________________

7.) ¿Qué sabe usted acerca de este proyecto?
   _________________________________
8.) Pienso que un lago en esta comunidad sería bueno para la ciudad San Bernardino. ¿Cómo sería? (no lo conozco para nada  no conozco  no se  si lo conozco  si lo conozco bien)  5  4  3  2  1

9.) ¿Cómo podría afectar su vida cotidiana, la reurbanización? (trabajo, calidad de vida, alojamiento)


10.) ¿Cómo sería afectada la comunidad si se construye un lago y tiendas comerciales?


11.) ¿Si se leva acaba la reurbanización, en que manera le causaría dificultades o problemas?


12.) ¿Si se leva acaba la reurbanización, en que manera como le beneficiaría o le dirías oportunidades?


13.) Podría mudarse (de una casa a otra) para que pase el propósito. ¿Cómo sería? (no lo conozco para nada  no conozco  no se  si lo conozco  si lo conozco bien)  5  4  3  2  1

14.) ¿Si la ciudad quiere que se mude, cual será la cosa más importante para usted en hacer esta decisión?


15.) ¿Si la ciudad lo(a) pide a mudarse, a donde irá usted?


16.) ¿Que tipo de información le gustaría para sentirse mejor involucrado en este proyecto? (información sobre la reurbanización  mapas de la zona sobre el proyecto  cuando empieza las juntas públicas  sus derechos, si la ciudad lo(a) pide a mudarse  otro)

17.) ¿Cuales son algunas maneras en la que ustedes o sus vecinos podrían colaborar con los políticos de la ciudad?
18) ¿Qué le gustaría decirles los políticos de la ciudad a sobre reurbanización en su comunidad?

19.) Hay algo más quería decir?

Gracias
APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT IN ENGLISH

AND SPANISH
This research study is being conducted to better understand San Bernardino residents' point of view about the economic redevelopment project called "Downtown Revitalization" (formerly known as "Vision 20/20 Lakes and Streams"). You will be asked survey questions in an interview that may take about 15 minutes. As an incentive to participate, you will receive an $8 gift certificate to Inland Center Mall.

The topic of the survey is the redevelopment project planned for this neighborhood. You will be asked for your opinions on how you think it might affect you and your community. You are welcome to give honest answers and suggest new ideas on ways residents can be more involved with project.

This study is being conducted by Kimberly Howard, a Social Work student at California State University San Bernardino. The study has been approved by the University's Institutional Review Board, a sub-committee of the Department of Social Work.

I understand that my name will not appear on the survey, nor will my name appear anywhere in the student's research paper. No information which identifies me will be released without my separate consent. I understand my participation in this study is voluntary. I can choose to stop at any time and still receive the $8 gift certificate to Inland Center Mall. I also understand that I can decline to answer any of the questions.

By marking an "X" on the line below, I agree that I understand the purpose of the study and freely consent to participate.

Mark "X" here: ___ Date__________
Este encuesta investigativa es para el propósito de entender la punta de vista de los residentes de San Bernardino en relación al proyecto de reurbanización se llama "Revitalización del Centro" (anteriormente se llamó "Visión 20/20 Lagos y Ríos."). Lo (la) vamos a pedir que tome esta encuesta. Esta encuesta dura hasta 15 minutos. Le vamos a dar, como compensación $8 para usar en el Inland Center Mall.

El tema de la encuesta será como este proyecto de desarrollo podría afectarse a usted y a su comunidad. Se espera que el grupo construya otras maneras en que los residentes pueden participar más en la formulación de planes y el cumplimiento del proyecto. Lo(la) vamos a pedir que nos de su opinión. Por favor, díganos que impacto tendrá el proyecto sobre su vida o su comunidad. Sienta libre a contestar con franqueza y dar sugerencias nuevas como loas vecinos pueden tener un papel las activó. Kimberly Howard está encargada de este estudio. Ella es estudiante, en la escuela de Social Work. El estudio ha sido aprobado por el Institucional Review Board de la escuela de Social Work (El Tribunal Institucional de Revisión).

Yo entiendo que mi nombre no va a parecer en este estudio, ni en un informe investigativo escrito por la estudiante. No se le va a dar a conocer ninguna información que me identifique sin una autorización propia. Entiendo que mi participación en este estudio es voluntario. Puedo parar en cual quiera hora y todavía recibir $8 del Inland Center Mall. También entiendo que no debo contestar ninguna pregunta.

Tachar un "X" en la línea abajo, Entiendo el prosito del estudio y doy me autorización sin reserva para participar. También Reconozco que me edad es 18 años o más.

Tache "X" aquí: __________ Fecha____________________
APPENDIX G

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT IN

ENGLISH AND SPANISH
Thank you for participating in this survey. This interview was meant to better understand local residents' hopes and concerns about "Downtown Revitalization" urban redevelopment. The goal of the interview was to find out about residents' knowledge of the redevelopment plan and to explore new ways for local residents to feel more involved in the city's planning and implementation of the project.

It is this student's hope that the interview encouraged you to advocate for yourself in the midst of this future change. Future redevelopment can reflect the needs of the people here, if neighbors, like yourself, are involved in the planning and implementation of the project.

Thank you for participating.

If you have any questions regarding the study, please contact Professor Sondra Doe, Kimberly's advisor, at the California State University Department of Social Work, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407 or call (909) 880-5497.

If you would like your own copy of the results of this study or have questions about the study, please contact Dwight Rodgers at (909)383-1657 in the Youth-Build Office after June 1st 2002.

For current maps or project plans about Downtown Revitalization, contact Tim Cook in the Mayor's Office (909)384-5133 or see www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us

For a copy of your rights in the event you are asked to sell your home and relocate, contact the Economic Development Agency at (909)663-1044.
Gracias por su participación en la junta hoy. Este
conversación serve para entender las esperanzas y que has
que tengan los residentes locales acerca del
revitalización de centro ("Downtown Revitalización"). La
meta de esta junta es descubrir el conocimiento de los
residentes en referencia al plan para la reurbanización y
también para encontrar nuevas maneras en que los
residentes sientan de planes y el cumplimiento del
proyecto.

Es la esperanza de este estudiante la junta promovía
un sentido de comunidad que lo(la) informe de algunos de
sus derechos, y que lo(la) anime para defenderse en medio
de este cambio. Promover participación del ciudadano, en la
formulación de lanes y cumplimiento del proyecto es una
manera en que cambios en el futuro. En esta comunidad
reflejara mejor las necesidades de la gente en la zona del
proyecto.

Gracias por su participación.

Si tengas algunas preguntas en referencia al estudio,
puedes hablar con la Maestra Sondra Doe, la consejera de
Kimberly al California State University Department of
Social Work, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA
92407 o llamar a (909) 880-5497.

Si quiere una copia de los resultados de este estudio o
tiene preguntas sobre el estudio, por favor llame a Dwight
Rodgers en la oficina del Youth Build (909) 383-1657,
después de 1/6/02.

Si necesitas las mapas de la zona del proyecto, o
información de "Downtown Revitalización", llame a Tim Cook
en la oficina del Mayor Valles, (909) 384-5133 o
www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us

Por una copia de sus derechos, si la ciudad lo(la) pide a
mudarse, llame el "Economic Development Agency a
(909) 663-1044.
APPENDIX H

CODE BOOK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 gender</th>
<th>1: M</th>
<th>2: F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 language</td>
<td>1: Spanish</td>
<td>2: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 time at residence</td>
<td>1: (0-1) years</td>
<td>2: (2-5) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 current ownership</td>
<td>1: rent</td>
<td>2: own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 familiar with project</td>
<td>5: strongly disagree</td>
<td>4: disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 (source of information)</td>
<td>neighbors, friends: no0 yes1</td>
<td>newspaper: 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 what is known</td>
<td>1: truthful information</td>
<td>2: false information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 daily life affected</td>
<td>1: transportation</td>
<td>2: financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 community affected</td>
<td>1: historical structures lost</td>
<td>2: poor displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 personal inconveniences, challenges</td>
<td>1: construction during implementation</td>
<td>2: neighborhood no longer affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 benefits of a lake in</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>1: tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 willing to relocate</td>
<td>5: strongly disagree</td>
<td>4: disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 considerations for moving
1  near job
2  near family
3  near school
4  affordability of housing
5  nicer, safer neighborhood
6  don't know

Q15 plan for relocation
1  Stay in San Bernardino
2  Out of San Bernardino
3  Don't know

Q16 information wanted by residents
redevelopment  yes1 no0
relocation rights  1  0
meetings  1  0
maps  1  0

Q17 ways to collaborate with city
1  show of opposition
2  show of support, encouragement
3  capacity building
   public education, communication
5  Don't know

18. residents' comments to city officials
1  expression of empathy
2  criticism of project
3  criticism of process
4  support for project
APPENDIX I

OPINIONS OF LOCAL RESIDENTS
### Resident's Hopes (+) for “Downtown Revitalization” Versus Residents' Concerns (-) for “Downtown Revitalization”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hopes</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New recreation for children &amp; families</td>
<td>Financial hardship &amp; hassle of moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More job opportunities / better economy</td>
<td>Historical Buildings torn down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification of community</td>
<td>Poor resident’s displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly residents inconvenienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing small, Hispanic businesses affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuisance of actual construction of lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Would a lake be good for the city of San Bernardino?

- Yes: 50%
- No: 35%
- Undecided: 15%

### What would you say to city officials about redevelopment in your neighborhood?

- Empress empathy (over the severity of poverty & crime in the area): 16.7%
- Criticize the project itself: 22.2%
- Criticize the planning process: 22.2%
- Show support for the project: 38.9%

### How might city officials successfully collaborate with the community?

- Let relocated families continue attending the same schools.
- Hire local people to build and sustain the new lakefront area.
- Do personal interviews, door-to-door to ask residents’ for their advice and concerns.
- Do more outreach and education to inform local residents about how they would benefit.
- Make the lake safe and accessible to the public.
APPENDIX J

RESIDENTS SOURCE OF INFORMATION
Residents' source of information regarding “Downtown Revitalization”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper/newsletter</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors/friends</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No source</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City web site</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information requested by residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information on the process of redevelopment</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on relocation, rights &amp; benefits</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitations to meetings or public forums</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current map of the project area</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you know about Downtown Revitalization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accurate information</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate information</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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