HOPE VI: Cityscape Symposium

Jennifer A. Stoloff, PhD
Social Science Analyst
PD&R, Program Evaluation Division







This issue of Cityscape had four papers about HOPE VI that examined neighborhood and individual level effects.

- Neighborhood level: spillover effects
 - Are crime and poverty reduced?
 - Do housing values increase?
- Individual level: impacts of relocation on residents of the former housing developments
 - Are they more likely to work?
 - What is the quality of the new neighborhood?
 - How has moving affected their lives?



HOPE VI Neighborhood Spillover Effects in Baltimore by Nina Castells

Data presented on three projects in Baltimore

- Little evidence of spillover effects in the form of increased property values.
 - One case with weak positive effects on "the improvement of the surrounding neighborhood"
 - It involved a land swap so the spillover was not directly linked to the original location of the public housing development
- Qualitative information from local newspapers and interviews with city and housing experts presented to better understand:
 - implementation strategies
 - the community response to the HOPE VI redevelopment
 - other neighborhood changes and investments that may have affected property prices in the HOPE VI neighborhoods during the study period





HOPE VI and Neighborhood Economic Development: The Importance of Local Market Dynamics by Sean Zielenbach and Richard Voith

Include several measures of neighborhood economic development in Boston and Washington DC

Evidence of some spillover effects

"Best" area shows the least impact from HOPE VI, suggesting that other neighborhood improvements are potentially more powerful than the HOPE VI redevelopment.

"Market dynamics" in the nearby area largely explain the positive effects.

In already improving areas, a HOPE VI development is probably a follower and not a leader in positive neighborhood change.





Better Neighborhoods, Better Outcomes? Explaining Relocation Outcomes in HOPE VI by Edward G. Goetz

- Study of effects of dispersal on families in Duluth, Minnesota
- Do benefits accrue to families who have been involuntarily relocated by HOPE VI?
- Similar to other HOPE VI sites, families stayed in the central city.
- Families moved to neighborhoods with less poverty, less unemployment, higher incomes and fewer families receiving public assistance.
- However, no links between measures of neighborhood change and measures of individual outcomes.
- A decline in economic security was found in some instances.
- Findings run contrary to the popular idea that neighborhood level improvements will lead to better outcomes for individuals.





Neighborhood Institutions, Facilities and Public Space: A Missing Link for HOPE VI Residents' Development of Social Capital? by Alexandra M. Curly

Main question: does the neighborhood play a role in developing social capital? ("...trust, interactions, and ties with co-residents (and also with outsiders)")

Multivariate analyses of survey data indicate that neighborhood facilities and public spaces such as parks, libraries, and recreation facilities, were very strong predictors of trust and reciprocity among neighbors.

Hypothetically, more social capital will lead to better access to the labor market (among other things).

Public housing residents typically have little relevant social capital—

It is hypothesized that "bad" neighborhoods constrict access to social capital. If that's the case, then relocation should help.

This study finds that neighborhood-level benefits don't translate to individuallevel outcomes.







Conclusions

Some spillover effects are found, but these may also be due to a generally improving neighborhood.

For relocatees, improved neighborhood characteristics don't translate to better individual outcomes.

Findings may indicate that a "whole neighborhood" approach like the Choice Neighborhoods initiative would have a better chance of improving conditions at both the neighborhood and individual level.



