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According to the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, the District of Columbia ranks fourth in terms of housing price appreciation. Based on 2005 statistics, housing costs in the District has increased by 471.22% since 1980 and will appreciate by 20.53% in one year, and 118.87% in five years.\(^1\)

Unfortunately, income is not rising proportionally to housing costs. Additionally, there is a devastating flaw in the DC Legislature-enforced concept of rent control\(^2\). This city-wide problem of the cost of housing out-pacing the increase in residents’ incomes in addition to the unsound rent control system is a particularly devastating reality for residents who live in low income communities such as the Anacostia community (Anacostia) of the District of Columbia in the Southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia—many of whom rent housing units.\(^3\)

Anacostia is a community that is extremely rich in culture and history. This particular neighborhood houses The Anacostia Museum and Center for African American History and Culture, the Frederick Douglass House (a national historic landmark), public and private schools, private and public housing, DC government offices, health centers, and many churches.\(^4\) Despite these assets, much of
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1. [www.ofheo.gov](http://www.ofheo.gov)
2. Rent control is centered on two primary concepts—“base rent” and “rent ceilings”. Base rents are rents specified for a given year that the city deem affordable, which is done in an effort to maintain affordability for low-income residents. Rent ceilings, or the highest amount a landlord can charge for rent, are also instated on yearly basis to primarily compensate for inflation rates. However, rent ceilings are increased annually whether or not base rents increase, thus creating a great disparity between the two figures. Once there is a significant difference between the two figures, more often than not, landlords drastically increase rent prices (the law indicates that only a 30-day notification to residents in necessary), thereby forcing out tenants who can no longer afford to pay rent. The concept of rent control is only effective if the rent ceiling is functioning to maintain low prices.
3. [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)
4. [http://anacostia.si.edu](http://anacostia.si.edu)
the neighborhood has declined economically and many of the buildings and homes have become abandoned or in disrepair. Yet with DC’s vastly growing housing market and Anacostia’s assets, combined with Anacostia’s current underdeveloped status, because of these apparent assets, the fact remains that the housing market is growing vastly, this neighborhood is and this neighborhood is a “diamond in the rough” for developers; meaning that this is an ideal development site (geared toward potential high-income residents) for developers, due to the many positive aspects and attractions the community has to offer, despite its current poverty-stricken condition. For instance In other words, the cost of property remains relatively low as compared to other areas of the city, and with the impending plans to develop the entire Anacostia Waterfront, developers who market to upper middle and upper income residents, are buying up property and waiting to redevelop it when the property values have increased. for redevelopment in the Anacostia community.

However, some organizations and residents are working to also develop homes that are more affordable and attractive to the current lower income population of Anacostia. According to the 1999 census data, tract 76.01 (the Anacostia community) had about approximately 955 out of its 4540 total residents, or over 21%, receiving an income under the poverty level. Taken together, these are alarming statistics: With over 20% living below-poverty income level and the DC housing prices projected rise of 20% in just one year and a loss of more than 5,000 low-cost rental units in the past three years, while the number of low-income households rose simultaneously, the need for affordable housing is clearly evident. This need for

http://www.dcfpi.org/1-13-05hous.htm
affordable housing is just one of many social issues plaguing the community; however, a solution to this problem will contribute to the eventual improvement of the various other social concerns within the area. Home ownership instills a sense of accomplishment, belonging, and empowerment. In establishing affordable housing and giving the residents of this community the “power”, in a sense, the likelihood of more positive change increases greatly. It is virtually impossible to change a community without civic involvement. Another area of the District of Columbia where we are beginning to expand our research and that appears to be at risk for redevelopment and displacement is the North Capitol community.

The ultimate goal of the Faithworks-Georgetown University collaborative project is to develop affordable housing units not only in the Anacostia community, but also throughout the entire Ward 8 area, and ultimately beyond. The goal of my research with Faithworks is to determine potential challenges that are faced when trying to establish affordable housing in a low-income community, and to offer solutions for these challenges, or methods to avoid these potential problems. It is commonly known that the Anacostia community is an extremely marginalized community within the District, in establishing affordable housing in this area, we are hoping to not only fulfill the housing needs of the residents, but to also enrich the quality of living of the community in general.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

As previously mentioned, there are long-term and short-term goals for this particular project and as for my research, the following questions apply to both scenarios. These
questions attempt to unveil any problems that arise during a project of this type. In addition to addressing any potential challenges, the assets of the community, or more specifically, the churches, will also surface when trying to answer these questions.

Obviously, the project can be considered a success in the end if quality affordable housing is developed in the Anacostia community, and ultimately the entire Ward 8 area and other communities in need in the District. For my specific research questions, if solutions can be developed to any challenges or problems that occur throughout this collective development process, then the project will have succeeded. These solutions or suggestions will aid in the development process in other communities, and will hopefully facilitate the entire process for the collaborating parties. It is necessary to determine potential problems that may arise, because preparation also contributes to expediting the process of the project. In addition to the research questions, there are a few corresponding hypotheses listed, which attempt to predict the responses or reactions to the research questions.

What are the potential challenges, or benefits, of developing affordable/low income housing in the Anacostia Community of the District, in conjunction with local area churches (and possibly a network organization)?

- There may be conflicts with government owned land, or perhaps intense competition with outside development agencies trying to move into this community that has so much potential. The latter is a major issue of concern in regards to my project, because the Anacostia community is a hot commodity, and there is an existing interest in the area to build market rate townhouses among developers. When
specifically dealing with churches, there may be a situation where a church is already working with a network organization (external challenge), thereby eliminating any interest to work with Faithworks, or this existing partnership could work as an asset for our project, because there is already an established relationship between this church and network organization, which would dispel any feelings of hesitancy due to mistrust.

When working with these churches (and/or a network organization), what internal (issues within each church) or external (potential issues with outside entities, i.e. the government, WIN, etc.) challenges will be met when trying to organize such development?

Again, dealing with outside entities, whether they are churches, WIN, East of the River CPCP, DC World Vision, the government etc. The fact is, it is not easy to A) bring several individual groups together, and B) fully establish that we (Faithworks along with its Georgetown researchers, or any network organization) are trustworthy. One of the first questions that will more than likely be asked, specific to the churches, is what do we (Faithworks) get out of this project? More specific to the sub-question—an existing concern of Faithworks—is that we do not have what it takes to organize the many churches that may potentially jump on board this project. One possible solution to this is bringing in WIN, which specializes in organizing groups to work on one project.

Comment [U2]: Rephrase the hypotheses to fit your question: Internal, external challenges and state what you expect to happen. You may need to move some of your explanation to the literature review and then put your questions and hypotheses right before the methods section. This way you can argue why it is that you think this is the case, before you get to your hypothesis.
Will the possibility of varying interests among the different churches be an asset or a challenge in trying to achieve our goal?

The issue of varying interests could become a problem if the central focus of each of these interests is not the advancement of the community. That is, if we do work with multiple churches and each has its own agenda, with other interests in mind other than the development of affordable housing (i.e., the interest in the establishment of a school associated with the church, parking lots, childcare centers, etc.), then this clearly would not help us achieve our goal in the most efficient manner. However, if we can get the many participants on a similar (not even necessarily the same) page, then these varying interests could somehow help our project.

In thinking about these potential problems early on, we will be able to anticipate certain roadblocks that we may stumble upon, and deal with them in a more efficient manner due to our anticipation and preparation.

The Anacostia Community

The District as a whole is a city plagued with high crime rates, drugs, and low rates of affordable housing availability. The Anacostia community truly exemplifies these devastating afflictions on a smaller scale. Anacostia is majority black neighborhood located along the Anacostia River in Ward 8 of Southeast DC. It is currently inhabited by mostly low income residents, most of who deal daily with high crime rates, drugs, and lack of affordable housing previously described. Because of
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many of these negative components of the area, the community has not been developed. However, its ideal location—waterfront properties, great vistas, proximity to a metro stop, etc., and developmental potential are starting to be recognized and targeted by development organizations.

Anacostia is located in SE DC. It is a majority Black Neighborhood. It is currently inhabited by low income residents. Because of its location, it is one of the few places in the district that hasn’t been developed yet, and can be targeted.

Its located along the Anacostia River, beautiful vistas.

The Anacostia community is undoubtedly one in need of drastic revitalization efforts, not only to bring life back to the neighborhood, but to also prevent displacement. This is a fact that is not only being recognized by Faithworks Inc., but also other development and organizational agencies, as well as the federal and district governments. Mayor Williams recognized this need for improvement in March of 2000, when he introduced the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative. The objective of this particular initiative is to transform what is presently a physical racial and status (socioeconomic) rift between communities east of (the Anacostia River) and those west of the river, into a completely revitalized area that will not only unite the alienated areas, but also bring life to a community that is gradually losing touch with its historic roots. However, this initiative
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* dc.gov
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also threatens to gentrify the Anacostia community. Gentrification is the process of revitalizing (renovating housing, bringing in commercial facilities, etc.) a community in an effort to promote advancement or growth and provide opportunities (jobs, sources of entertainment, etc.) for the specific area. This concept was initially viewed as a positive component to assist declining or marginalized neighborhoods, but it has recently developed a reputation of being a device used by the upper-classes to dismantle low-income neighborhoods. It is not a matter of should redevelopment occur in this area—that is a given, this is a clearly in need of assistance; rather, it is a matter of what redevelopment occurs and who it is benefiting, because traditionally we know that the current residents of a low-income neighborhood are usually displaced. One of the major goals of Faithworks is to support the low-income people and their challenges, and housing is a priority for the residents of the Anacostia community.

If a development project to help the current residents of the community is not enacted, then it is likely that gentrification will lead to the displacement of these residents. Many residents of these predominantly black neighborhoods do fall victim to gentrification, and are forced out of their neighborhoods into precarious housing projects typically with high drug and crime rates. (Reverend Chambers Interview, November 22, 2005).

The current physical state of the Anacostia community is enough to support the need for revitalization; however, this revitalization needs to be geared toward the current low-income residents, rather than being aimed at attempting to eradicate or displace them. There are countless dilapidated and vandalized buildings, an evident homeless
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population, and litter crowding the sidewalks and streets. Although the image of these blatant problems paint a clear picture of the need for help, the actual statistics more clearly demonstrate this need, particularly in relationship to housing. The graph below displays the percentage of individuals in poverty for the nation, the District of Columbia and Anacostia’s census specific census tract.

**Comparison of Tract 76.01 (Anacostia) with the District of Columbia and the U.S**

(What is the graph showing? The percent of individuals living below poverty?)

![](graph.png)

As the graph shows, the percent of individuals in census tract 76.01 living below the poverty level is nearly twice as high as the U.S. as a whole. This poses the question; how can residents of this community support themselves (this includes the basic necessity of housing), when over one-fifth of that particular population is living below the poverty line? Adequate housing that lies in a price range that is affordable to these residents is a **must**—basic civil right that must be met by the government, according to the Fair Housing Act. (If what? Why shouldn’t they all just move to a more affordable neighborhood?). Without the development of these low-income housing units, displacement of these same
residents is undoubtedly a reality in the future. An additional issue is that the cost of housing that is available in the District is increasing exponentially, preventing low- and moderate-income families from being able to afford to live in the city. More statistical evidence of the demographic profile of those living in tract 76.01, according to the Census 2000 in Anacostia, the census website states that over 94.2% of the population is African American (the white population is a meager 2.54%). It appears that most of the residents are middle-aged, the most prevalent age range is 40-44 for both men and women, and children account for almost one-fourth of the population. Less than 40% of the population has high school diplomas, or the equivalent, and only a mere 4% have bachelor’s degrees. The leading income was a staggering $10,000 or less for just over 15% of the population, and the majority of the households are single female-headed.

These figures, again, exemplify the need for support in this community. These elements are indicative of who inhabits the neighborhood, why the neighborhood is in the condition that it is currently in, and of the great need of assistance—assistance that Faithworks seeks to provide to neighborhoods and residents afflicted to this degree.

(These figures were taken from the U.S. Census website).

Literature Review

What constitutes a social problem?

The loss of affordable housing constitutes a major social problem (Merrill, 1957). A social problem is defined as “a situation that threatens an established value and that is believed capable of amelioration by appropriate social action” (Merrill, 1957, p. 2). In other words, a social problem is an apparent
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threat or danger to a basic civil right, that can potentially be rectified by taking the appropriate steps to promote the necessary change. Merrill goes on to state that a social problem also “comprises three primary elements: a social situation on a comparatively large scale, a social value that is threatened, and a belief that the situation may be eliminated by organized social action.” The following discussion will address how each of these elements is illustrated within the current housing market in DC. As luxury developments are being built citywide few communities continue to be affordable, even to middle income individuals in the District. The current state, the underdevelopment, of this community can undoubtedly be considered a major social problem. For Anacostia, the loss of affordable housing can be considered the large social issue. Specifically, residents’ homes are being threatened because of the rising cost of housing in the Anacostia community. According to 1999 US census data, the minimum amount paid for housing in Ward 8 is roughly $112,000 (this figure has more than likely increased greatly) and the median income of Anacostia residents is about $32,930, with nearly 17% of the residents making less than $30,000 annually. This clearly illustrates the discrepancy between housing costs and low-incomes. The established value that is being threatened when a community loses housing that is affordable to low-and moderate-income people, is the fact that these groups are not being provided their basic rights to equal housing opportunities. Because everyone cannot afford luxury housing, there need to be opportunities for low-income individuals to have safe and affordable housing. These affordable housing opportunities in the District of Columbia are dwindling, and low-income people are being pushed out because the most of the development taking place is geared toward upper-income people. The major issue
in the District is that low-and moderate-income people are not being provided a sufficient alternative for housing. The great loss of individuals who are economically diverse could be considered the loss of a social value (the value of diversity and community stability).

Our goal in the project is to prevent this loss by helping to establish and maintain affordable housing in this community.

In addition to the Anacostia community, another example of this “threatened social value” is the situation unfolding in the Sursum Corda housing project in Northwest DC. The Sursum Corda housing community is part of the “New Communities” project, an effort to revitalize public housing sites and create a ‘mixed-income’ neighborhood. The plan will potentially double the number of housing units in the area, and will be comprised of 520 “very low income units” and between 1320 and 1520 total units. The project will also include a K-8 school, retail shops, and offices all in an effort to build a more inclusive community. Although this seems like a positive development plan, the reality is that the current residents of Sursum Corda are essentially being forced out. The guarantee of 520 “very low income units” again, appears to be a good thing, but this figure falls significantly short of the number of low-income residents currently living in the community; thereby, displacing the majority. Again, although this community is located in another area of the District, it serves as an example of what could potentially happen to Anacostia, should developers seek to establish a similar housing project in the Ward 8 area.

The belief that a “threatening situation may be eliminated by organized social action” is the idea behind Faithworks’ project, to develop affordable housing in this community.

11 http://planning.dc.gov
housing in an area of much need, the low-income community of Anacostia. If we look at Merrill’s definition of a social problem, we can easily substitute the appropriate aspects into the equation in terms of what is going on in the Anacostia community.

The established value that is being threatened when a community loses housing that low-income people can afford is that these people are not provided their rights to equal housing opportunities. Since everyone cannot luxury housing, there needs to be opportunities for low-income individuals to have safe and affordable housing. These opportunities in the District of Columbia are dwindling, and low-income people are being pushed out because the development that is taking place is for upper-income people. Low-income people are not being provided an alternative for housing. The “threatening situation” in this case is the potential redevelopment for the elites or gentrification in the area, which will ultimately lead to the displacement of the current residents. The established value, as stated in the Fair Housing Act, is the right fair housing—specifically, affordable housing. Lastly, Faithworks, in conjunction with local churches, is hoping to “ameliorate the situation” by taking “appropriate social action.”

In Washington DC, this situation is particularly large-scale, as luxury developments are being built citywide. Few communities continue to be affordable, even to middle-income individuals in the district.

The current state of this community can undoubtedly be considered a major social problem as I will show in the following statements. For Anacostia, the loss of affordable housing can be considered the large social issue. The loss of individuals who are economically and racially diverse could be considered the loss of a social value (the value of diversity and community stability). Our goal in the project is to ameliorate this loss by
helping to establish and maintain affordable housing in this community. This notion is true because the residents’ civil rights to equal (which would encompasses affordability) housing opportunities are being threatened, and there is the possibility of amelioration, which is what we are trying to achieve in my project. Merrill’s last element is directly related to my project.

It is this firm belief in the ability of Social action, more specifically, organized social action that is the driving force of this project to ignite change within this particular community of Anacostia, starting with the development of low-income housing. Although my primary focus throughout this project is geared toward the process of this development, that is how goal is achieved and what hinders or helps the process, it is necessary to point out the importance and necessity of this project in the Anacostia community. This is in fact, as Merrill points out, a social problem.

Part of what Merrill articulates in his work is the need to create social action that incorporates a network of individuals and groups to help ameliorate the social problems. The responsibility of community enhancement does not rest solely in the hands of individual the members of that community; rather, it is also the responsibility of neighboring communities to step-in and assist in this improvement. This is where Faithworks Inc., along with a potential networking organization’s help, comes in to “bridge the gap” (Rinder, 1958DATE?). This concept of, “bridging the gap” best relates to the current project as a means of connecting the community with resources or assets that it may not have the capacity to attain on its own.

Faithworks, a nonsectarian, nonprofit consulting and development organization specializes in working with mission-driven institutions to improve their community
ministry through the development of human and real estate assets (Faithworks brochure).

Faithworks has specific access to developers who are open to affordable housing, knowledge of the laws related to development, and experience with large scale development projects that house low income. Arguably, in communities such as Anacostia where 55.6% of population are renters—most of whom are encountering severe problems in terms of the percentage of their income going toward rent (Stockman 1992), and few little development has taken place, it is very likely that residents would not have these resources on their own. Also, as a small voluntary organization, Faithworks is able to establish a more direct or primary relationship with a potential partner which could prove to be more beneficial than a less personal partnership with a larger more bureaucratic organization (Dror 1960).

However, Faithworks does lack several specific assets. These include, the ability to organize community residents and connect them to political or community policies (Greenberg 2000); knowledge of community history; or the capital to develop housing on their own. For these reasons, it is necessary to partner with organizations and individuals who have these resources. As the very foundation of communities, churches often have these resources and a strong interest in human and community development (Brown 1996, Cavendish 2000, and Savage 2000).

The churches that we approach often have the desire to improve their community, but as indicated by the literature they may not have all the means to do so. (The capacity of the churches will be determined after analysis of interview responses) This fact, the churches’ inability—due to inadequate means, to act on any aspiration to improve the quality of life for its community residents, again reiterates the idea that the problems of
the Anacostia community are social problems. This ‘inability’ is not the fault of the churches themselves; rather, these social problems have evolved into entities that require attention that may be greater than what the churches are equipped to handle alone.

Although Faithworks is hoping to assist with these churches’ shortcomings, they too have their limitations. For example, Faithworks’ disassociation with the community demonstrates the need of their church’s ties to the community, or perhaps on a more general scale, Faithworks, being a small organization, does not have the clout or power of a larger development team. However, when two (or more) groups are working together, they rely on each other for their strengths, and that is what we are hoping to do by working with these churches in the Anacostia community.

**Challenges of a Collective Effort**

*As a collective effort, we hope to capitalize on the assets of many people/organizations. However, we also expect that the creativity and perspective exhibited in a collective effort will produce several types of challenges.* Although not directly stated, Bennis (date 1956) suggests that challenges can be broken into two categories, internal and external challenges. Focusing on the external challenges, one of his first points is that more often than not, when working as a team in social research, an issue of “lack of effective interdisciplinary cooperation” arises (Bennis p. 2221956). “Interdisciplinary” is defined as team ‘research’ in which participants represent varied perspectives. Through this statement Bennis is implying that it is often difficult, at least initially, to get the many components of the project team to work efficiently together, despite possibly having the
same or similar goals. The actual organization or bringing together of the various groups is probably going to be the first challenge of this project, but this issue of “effective cooperation” will surely arise (Bennis p.2221956). One concern might be the continued distrust between African American organizations and a predominantly White organization. For instance, most of the developers are white and are taking advantage of predominately.

There is also the potential problem of time restraints, or “time pressures” (Bennis p.2241956). This may not be a challenge for those organizations such as Faithworks Inc., the involved Anacostia churches, and whichever networking organization gets on board becomes involved, but this is unquestionably an issue for student work, because students’ ability to work on a project is limited to an academic year. In addition to the constraints of the academic year, there is also the time threat of other developers who may not have an interest in establishing affordable housing making the first move might beat us to the punch!

Government owned lands and privately owned lands both want top dollar. Another “external demand” that may interfere with the production development of this project, is the potential conflict with the government in regards to land ownership (Bennis p.2251956). There is the similar issue faced when dealing with privately owned lands, in that the government may not want to commit the use of government-owned land to low- and moderate-income housing development, and instead will hold onto the land waiting for its ‘ideal’ buyer, or perhaps simply just top dollar. Although we are hoping that this potential problem will be avoided because of our ability to preview such data as land
ownership through asset mapping, this could still pose as a problem down the road, in the event of a mistake on our part.

A final potential concern that Bennis addresses is “the problem of accepting the new man”, which he suggests has the makings to “have a disabling effect” on the project (Bennis p. 2291956). In application to my project specifically, “the new man” can be interpreted as an outside entity—Faithworks Inc. (and its Georgetown University researchers) and possibly its partnered networking organization. Understandably, the churches of this marginalized community may have their qualms, or concerns about the motives of an outside developer, about or working with someone outside of the Anacostia community. Bennis labels this as “ambivalence towards interdisciplinary cooperation” (Bennis p. 2261956).

Robert Janes (DATE1958) presents a similar framework in his piece, offering five key factors of action programs. I have chosen to focus on three of these five factors, the first of which, is a direct indication of whether or not a project will be successful and that is “community involvement” (Janes p. 53-41958). I have stated that a social problem is not only the responsibility of that community that is being threatened by the problem, but also the responsibility of surrounding communities, but I firmly believe that the targeted community’s involvement, specifically the churches’ involvement (Brown1996 and Savage 2000), is a chief contributor in the ultimate improvement of that community. Janes hypothesizes that “it is the [action] program itself which accounts primarily for the success of the project” (Janes p. 541958). Although I am a firm believer in an outside force’s ability to motivate, I also strongly believe that the, in this case, deprived community must first be self-motivated and want to be involved in order to achieve...
One point that Janes includes, and that I do agree with, in this hypothesis is that he believes that any community can have a successful outcome; it is not merely limited to higher-class-income communities and/or predominantly white communities. In his work he refers to a case of community improvement actions taken in Hyde Park, Illinois, an urban area within Chicago, in which they succeeded in improving the overall state of the community, and a case in Bloomington, Illinois (not an urban community) in which an attempt at improvement resulted in failure. “Divisive community structure combined with an inadequate program” is also another factor to be considered, which could contribute to failure (Janes p.541958). This presents a problem of not only an inadequate program (which we are hoping to combat inadequacy by teaming up with a networking organization, since we [Faithworks] specialize in development, not organizing), but also the potential problem of having several churches involved, but with dissimilar or self-interested goals. Racial differences may also undermine the success of the project (Wilson 2000), due to the fact that most developers coming into these marginalized neighborhoods are white, and the minorities are taken advantage of traditionally. These differences between the predominantly African American churches and Faithworks may posit feelings of distrust. One way to avoid this potential problem is to place great emphasis not only on what the apparent differences are between the two groups, but instead on the common goal or aspiration of promoting human and community growth, more specifically to developing affordable housing (Wilson 2000). These differences that exist between the two groups may also prove to be assets that contribute to the project.
A preliminary concern of Faithworks is to whom do we approach in the Acnacostia community to ignite change? James McKee points out that there is a certain “power structure of the community”, or in other words an “inner-core” (McKee p.1971958). Before we can begin our interviews, we must determine the “inner-core” of the community. This is someone or a group that is very influential within the given community, and therefore would facilitate the process of our project. Again, the role of the black church as a power base in the African American community defines this notion of the “inner core” (Brown 1996), which is essential to successfully achieving community change. An example of a potential “inner-core” within the Anacostia community is the Reverend Willie Wilson of Union Temple Baptist Church. This is an individual who is not only a widely recognized figure within the community, but also regionally and possibly even nationally.

**Summary**

The overall theme of the literature appears to support the idea of a collective research project community based research. The literature does present certain conflicts that arise when conducting a research project in such a manner; however, these challenges do not seem to outweigh the strength or influence of a collective effort. As with any project, problems—both internal and external or challenges, will arise, but it is not easy for a deprived community single-handedly spark change. There will be issues of mistrust, but throughout the process we must bear in mind that the Anacostia community is not solely responsible for its present condition and its future, we too (along with other
neighboring communities) must assume a good deal of this responsibility and contribute to its improvement.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Given the current situation of Anacostia—the potential displacement of residents due to gentrification, and the extremely high presence of churches in the area (over 60 churches are present in the area), I am assessing the potential challenges faced by churches in the Anacostia Community who hope to develop affordable housing, possibly in a collaborative effort. In addition to addressing any potential challenges, this study also examines the assets that can assist in developing affordable housing, that are held with the community at large, and more specifically held within the churches. The ultimate success of the project is determined by the development of quality affordable housing is developed in the Anacostia community, and ultimately the entire Ward 8 area and other communities in need in the District.

However, for this specific study, I am focusing on several preliminary research questions that support the ultimate objectives. For this project, success will be exhibited if solutions can be found to the challenges or problems that occur throughout the process of developing church-sponsored affordable housing. It is necessary to determine potential problems that may arise, because preparation for the anticipation of potential problems also contributes to expediting the process of the project. These solutions will aid in the development process in other communities, and will support the entire process of organizing churches to develop affordable housing.
To address the general questions regarding the challenges of developing affordable housing, as well as the assets held by community members that can support the creation of affordable housing, I have asked the following 3 research questions:

1. What are the potential challenges or benefits of developing affordable/low income housing in the Anacostia Community of the District, in conjunction with local area churches (and possibly a network organization)?

   **Hypothesis:** There may be conflicts with government owned land—similar to the issues possibly encountered with private owners, in that they may want to hold onto their land for a top bidder, rather than using it to develop affordable housing for low-income people, or perhaps intense competition with outside development agencies trying to move into this community that has so much potential. The latter is a major issue of concern because the housing market in Anacostia community is and there is an existing interest in the area to build market-rate townhouses among developers.

   • When specifically dealing with churches, there may be a situation where a church is already working with a network organization (external challenge), thereby eliminating any interest to work with Faithworks, or this existing partnership could work as an asset for our project, because there is already an established relationship between this church and network organization, which would dispel any feelings of hesitancy due to mistrust.

   • **Hypothesis:** The predominantly African American churches may not want to work with a predominantly White organization such as Faithworks. This
resistance or hesitancy to work directly with an organization predominantly of a different racial/ethnic background may be attributed not only to the fact that many marginalized African American low-income residents have traditionally been taken advantage of by outsider non-African American developers, but also because the motives of the non-African American organization are unclear and not understood.

2. When working with these churches (and/or a network organization), what internal (issues within each church) or external (potential issues with outside entities, i.e. the government, WIN\textsuperscript{12}, etc.) challenges will be met when trying to organize such development?

- **Hypothesis:** A somewhat obvious external challenge is dealing with outside entities, whether they are churches, WIN, East of the River CPCP, DC World Vision, the government etc. The fact is, it is not easy to A) bring several individual groups together, and B) fully establish that we (Faithworks along with its Georgetown researchers, or any network organization) are trustworthy. One of the first questions that will more than likely be asked, specific to the churches, is what do we (Faithworks) get out of this project? More specific to the sub-question—an existing concern of Faithworks’ is that we do not have what it takes to organize the many churches that may potentially jump on board this project. One possible solution to this is bringing in WIN, which specializes in organizing groups to work on one project. Also, an internal challenge is a possibility that

\textsuperscript{12} Washington Interfaith Network—an interfaith, non-partisan potically active grassroots agent that specializes in organizing different groups.
members of the churches may not want to devote church funds to taking on a project of this type, or perhaps that the church itself may not currently have the financial means to take on a project of this caliber.

Will the possibility of varying interests among the different churches be an asset or a challenge in trying to achieve our goal?

The issue of varying interests could become a problem if the central focus of each of these interests is not the advancement of the community. That is, if we do work with multiple churches and each has its own agenda, with other interests in mind other than the development of affordable housing (i.e. the interest in the establishment of a school associated with the church, parking lots, childcare centers, etc.), then this clearly would not help us achieve our goal in the most efficient manner. However, if we can get the many participants on a similar (not even necessarily the same) page, then these varying interests could somehow help our project.

In thinking about these potential problems early on, we will be able to anticipate certain roadblocks that we may stumble upon, and deal with them in a more efficient manner due to our anticipation and preparation.

DATA AND METHODS

As stated above, the primary goal of this project led by Faithworks Inc. is to establish affordable housing in the District, primarily in the Anacostia and North Capitol
communities. This development will hopefully lead to the creation of other benefits for the community as a whole. In phase one of this project (Spring of 2005), quantitative data was collected through asset mapping of the Anacostia community. This data includes, the number of churches in the community, any land owned by these community churches, the amount of land owned, and the value of this property. Using this information, we derived a list of optimal partner churches, based primarily on these physical assets. For phase two of the project, we have devised interview questions to determine if there are any churches that are interested in working in conjunction with Faithworks Inc., what the needs of the community are from the perspective of each church, and if there are any conflict issues when it comes to working in a collaborative effort.

**Research Methodology**

In this study we are collecting information on the interest of the churches in a collaborative effort to establish low-income housing, as well as collecting information on additional types of needs in the Anacostia and the community needs in addition to housing. Interviews seem to be the optimal method of data collection for this project. Because there is little literature that specifically addresses the issues we are trying to tackle, addressing, so direct conversations that allow pastors to share various challenges they are facing, essentially, serves as more useful tool in an appropriate research methodology (citation) determining the particular challenges associated with collaborative work of this nature. This informal/conversational interview format not only allows the pastor to respond candidly, but it also enables the interviewer to ask follow-up questions of clarification or elaboration immediately. Additionally, with
this format, we are hoping to discover new answers to the questions posed in the interview (Appendix D) that the literature does not include.

Also, participants were also sought out, based on established connections. For example, a meeting was setup with the North Capitol Ecumenical Council members of churches from the LeDroit Park/Eckington neighborhood through a Georgetown University research team member who attends a church in that particular area—one of the Council’s member churches. This method of seeking out participants was adopted as a means of acquiring participants by essentially already having one foot in the door—a benefit that does not accompany cold calling.

Phase one of this project began in the spring of 2005. During this time, data was collected on 62 faith-based organizations in the Anacostia community, and we determined how much of the available land was church owned land, the exact acreage of these properties, and the approximate values of these properties. This information was collected through publicly accessible websites and databases. From this broad list of 62 FBO’s we have narrowed it down to roughly twelve optimal potential partners, the “Top 12”, based on their physical and financial assets, known human assets, and activity in the community. Before we can actually begin the development phase of this project, we must first determine what churches (beginning with the “Top 12”) have a shared interest in the development of affordable housing in this community. This will be determined by calling each of the churches that remain on the “Top 12” list (we will contact other churches not on this “Top 12” list, should we not come across any interested parties), and if interested, we will send an information packet, and set up a meeting time, at which point we will conversationally ask our interview questions in an effort to not only
determine if the data we have is accurate (in terms of their physical assets), but also that once they are completely aware of the vision of the project, they are still interested. The most pertinent of these questions in terms of my research, are questions number three, nine, eleven—which specifically ask what the needs are of the given community (attempting to prompt why these needs have not been met), what challenges/issues affect local community projects, and lastly, what the potential problems are in working with Faithworks or another outside partner. (A copy of the calling script—which verbally attains consent, the interview introduction—which mentions confidentiality, the interview questions, and the contact information for introductory meetings are attached in Appendices A, B, C, and D).

The responses to these interview questions will have been assessed by the Georgetown research assistants, coded (compared from interview to interview), and analyzed. These responses will assist in determining if the goals of our project are realistic, and if the interviewees are sound candidates as potential partners. The pastors’ responses were collected through note-taking during the interview, and these responses were then paired with the corresponding question. As stated in the interview introduction, the identity of all respondents and their responses are kept confidential, and are reviewed only by Faithworks and its Georgetown University researchers.

Research Participants

Our subjects were primarily identified through asset mapping, which was conducted in the spring of 2005. Their physical assets are accessible through public Internet sites, and with this information we compiled a list of the top churches—in terms of property ownership, property values, etc. Also available publicly is the contact information of our
subjects, which was used to make the initial phone calls to determine if an interest in a project of this nature exists. Once we determined which churches were actually interested, they were given a consent form that reviews the goals and specifics of the project. (see Appendix E) We are currently working with three interviewees from the Historic Anacostia, Barry Farms, and LeDroit Park/Eckington neighborhoods. — Reverend Chambers of Younge Memorial, Pastor Burton of Macedonia Baptist, and the North Captiol Ecumenical Council, which consists of Metropolitan Wesley, St. Martin’s, Franklin United Methodist, Mt. Olive United Methodist, Mt. Bethel, St. George’s, and Mt. Pleasant (see Appendix F for the actual meeting attendees notes from these interviews).

Results

*What are the potential challenges of developing affordable/low-income housing in the Anacostia Community of the District of Columbia, in conjunction with local area churches (and possibly a network organization)?*

As hypothesized, the three interviewees mentioned several challenges—political, internal, and otherwise, that have interfered with and continue to hinder any progress toward developing affordable housing in their communities, these problems are also evident in the District at large. Again, the interview was conducted in an informal manner, in which the pastors managed to cover all of our questions without us actually asking them verbatim. The fact that the pastors seemed to provide open responses to the questions, truly assists in determining what the appropriate next steps are in a project of this nature. The most “popular” question, in terms of igniting the most conversation and/or intense response, among the three interviewees was undoubtedly question number...
“What do you see as the challenges or issues affecting local community projects?”

This was one of the key questions within our interview, specific to my project, because it prompted a direct response to what I wanted to determine in my research. The most frequent response to this particular question (all of the pastors gave similar responses) was that land is scarce in the District—“does the district still have available properties?”

(taken from the second interview)—Reverend Livingston, Mt. Bethel. Limited physical resources (i.e. land), left all of the interviewees feeling somewhat less than optimistic about the development of affordable housing. This limited availability was attributed not only to land speculators, but also political practices. This issue of politics that was frequently brought up (specifically during the interview with Reverend Chambers, of Youngs Memorial) when discussing the ‘available land shortage’ was related to the effects of gentrification—what seems to be perceived, based on the pastors’ responses, as a political tool to displace low- and moderate-income people.

When working with these churches (and/or a network organization), what internal or external challenges will be met when trying to organize development?

Additionally, one pastor took the politicism of community redevelopment to another level, by openly stating that it is “who you know” and that “you learn your level and you learn to live within that level”. This can be perceived as an external challenge to organizing development. In saying “level”, the pastor is referring to one’s status in the hierarchal structure of society. The pastor is implying that few outsiders (primarily non-minorities and members of higher socioeconomic levels) would assist a low-income African American community, and do so with good intentions. Again, this feeling of pessimism was a recurring theme in the interviews, despite an interest in pursuing a
partnership and perhaps combating this issue of limited affordable housing availability. Another unanticipated issue that came up in one of the interviews was the resistance of current residents in one of the neighborhoods to the emergence of affordable housing. This opposition to the development of affordable housing is directly related to the stereotypes and/or associations that accompany the people that this housing is geared toward. Perhaps it is naivety, but this is a challenge that I did not foresee in my hypotheses. Please see Appendix G for a coding schema.

Based on the interviews, it also became clear that these churches are already active in their communities. Pastor Burton of Macedonia Baptist referred to a “transitional” unit that the church subsidizes to a family “trying to get on their feet”; a church in the LeDroit Park neighborhood did similar work in that they essentially adopted people into a program to assist in getting their lives together—“these people are now working and looking for affordable housing”. Interviewee number one; Reverend Chambers of Youngs Memorial is also interested in developing a community center and senior center, in addition to pursuing affordable housing development with Faithworks. This involvement in the community seemed to correlate to their desire to establish a partnership with Faithworks. There is a clear desire to work in conjunction with a trusted outside entity, which directly corresponds to the aforementioned challenge of not being able to achieve the monumental task of establishing affordable housing alone. Yet another common response among the interviewees was the perceived role of Faithworks. It was apparent that the churches would provide passion (a characteristic notable of Faithworks as well) and the valuable asset of knowing what the community—meaning both the environment or physical
neighborhood, and the residents) truly needs and wants, and Faithworks, and any other outside partner, would contribute the “know-how”.

Despite being from different churches and neighborhoods, a common interest and/or vision undeniably existed among the churches. Because Faithworks specializes in housing development, the specific commonality was affordable housing development; however, there was a recurring theme of “just wanting to do what is not only needed for, but also what is best for the community as a whole”.

**Discussion**

The data seem to support my hypotheses. There are apparent issues when it comes to acquiring land—due to political restrictions, competition (i.e. the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative), and in some cases not knowing how to find and obtain suitable properties. Trust, in terms of Faithworks’ motives, is an issue that has not surfaced over the course of the interviews. This matter is prompted in question number ten. The only negative response to this question pertained to the well-established organizing group, WIN. When asked about potentially working with the organizing agency, one interviewee adamantly opposed working in conjunction with the group, stating that they have “a racketeering attitude”. Initially, I believed that trust would be a major issue, which would, at the very least, slow down the process of achieving our goal of establishing affordable housing. After conducting the interviews, it was evident that Faithworks’ reputation, somewhat, preceded it. All of the churches were comfortable with the issues discussed—the only signs of doubt surfacing when it came to talking about land availability. **This concern about land availability again exemplifies how the Georgetown University/Faithworks team would be an asset to the project because of our**
research capabilities. Through extensive research on the DC Office of Tax and Revenue database, we have been able to identify numerous vacant and tax arrearage properties that could serve as potential sites for the development of affordable housing units.

Although there is somewhat of a feeling of uncertainty about the possibility of affordable housing development in the city, several avenues of opportunity have emerged throughout the course of the project. A viable option that has surfaced is the concept of a community land trust. The Institute for Community Economics developed a model in the 1960s known as a Community Land Trust (CLT) to assist in maintaining affordability for current and future low- and moderate-income residents, despite a growing housing market. CLTs are non-profit organizations that acquire properties then typically sell 99-year renewable leases—which are renewable and inheritable, while retaining preemptive option to buy back. Through an established formula equity is limited for residents, which regulates inflation, but speculation is prevented and price increases are controlled. Community Land Trusts contest the effort to displace low- and moderate-income residents, and instead, encourage housing ownership among these groups. The use of land trusts not only aids in preventing displacement and establishing long-term affordable housing, but they also promote “community” in its most traditional sense, by strengthening typically marginalized groups. Because the ultimate goal is to promote community, land trusts frequently accompany supplementary tools such as tenant organizing, credit training, financing support, etc. to assist in low- and moderate-income residents owning affordable housing.

The community land trust model is already being utilized in the District. The Anacostia Community Land Trust is a joint venture of a local private developer known for being
active in the affordable housing development effort, and a local Southeast DC pastor. The two are seeking to acquire property in Poplar Point Park and develop 650 affordable housing units, utilizing the limited equity model previously described. This idea of a land trust is just one of several possibilities that serves as a way to achieve the establishment of affordable housing in the area.

Data Liabilities...
Appendix A:

**Script for Contacting Potential Partners**

Hello, my name is ____, I am a Georgetown University student (may not apply) calling on behalf of Faithworks Inc. (may I speak to Reverend ___ or with someone who can talk with me about an upcoming meeting with community church leaders, concerning potential re-development in the Anacostia community—if yes, proceed; if no, say is there a more convenient time to contact you? If no, thank you for your time OR may I send you a letter regarding our project) We are a non-profit faith-based development firm, with a strong interest in working in the Anacostia community. Because we are a faith-based organization, we are hoping to work with local churches in an effort to achieve our goal of developing affordable housing in the Anacostia community. We are contacting several community pastors and/or representatives of local churches (if talking to a networking organization, simply substitute “representatives from networking organizations” for “reps of local churches) in the hopes that they will attend a meeting (when we determine a definite time & place, that should be included here) in which we will distribute a summary of our project thus far; provide an informative overview of the area—which will disclose existing assets of the community; and conduct a presentation in which we will discuss the present challenges within the ward, again reiterate the existing assets within the community, and cover our research methods, among other things. We look forward to working and thank you very much for your time.
Appendix B

Introduction for the Interview Questions

Welcome, and thank you for agreeing to meet with us today. For those (I was not sure as to whether this intro is going to be delivered on an individual basis, if so then we can merely re-word “those” so it is applicable) of you who may not be familiar with Faithworks Inc., they (or we, depending on the speaker—for example, if Bob is speaking, then he can go into a brief explanation [as I do here] of Faithworks, and then mention that we are merely assistants to/a resource for Faithworks, etc.) are a non-profit faith-based community development firm, that seek out marginalized or neglected areas and try to establish affordable housing along with other features that may enhance or benefit that particular community. We, Georgetown University students and faculty, are serving as researchers for this particular project and are working in conjunction with Faithworks Inc.

As previously stated, Faithworks is a development firm. Anacostia is a community that is rich in history; however, current issues with housing and crime do not serve as an accurate depiction of this neighborhood that at one time reflected the true spirit of an urban community. Because this community faces certain housing challenges, it is an ideal area to work in for Faithworks. Faithworks is seeking to work with the Anacostia community as a whole, and as such we are approaching the churches of Anacostia. In a joint-effort we hope to establish affordable housing for current residents
in an effort to improve the lives of these residents, create solidarity within the community, and ultimately, to prevent the displacement of these residents.

(Introduce the questions) In regard to these questions, it should be known that your responses will be kept confidential. No outside individuals will have access to your responses at any point during this project. Faithworks Inc. and its researchers will use your responses in an effort to determine if our project and/or goals are feasible in the community, if there are any potential partner churches (or network organizations, depending on the audience) with shared or similar interests in the area, and/or there are any existing available resources within the community.

Appendix C

Contacts for Introductory Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBO Name</th>
<th>Pastor</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambassador Baptist</td>
<td>Rev. Roy Settles, Jr.</td>
<td>687-1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Shaw United Methodist</td>
<td>Pastor Ernest Lyles</td>
<td>889-3660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem Baptist</td>
<td>Pastor James Coates</td>
<td>889-1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell AME</td>
<td>Rev. Rodger Reed</td>
<td>889-3877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Mt. Joy</td>
<td>Rev. Richard Allen</td>
<td>678-0962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia Baptist</td>
<td>Pastor Garfield Barton</td>
<td>678-8486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews Memorial Baptist</td>
<td>Rev. Joan Buchanan</td>
<td>889-3907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Perpetual Help</td>
<td>Fr. Donald Fest, SJ</td>
<td>678-4994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Kendrick Curry</td>
<td>581-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>Pastor Curtis Stanley</td>
<td>581-3387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Temple Baptist</td>
<td>Rev. Willie Wilson</td>
<td>678-8822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Temple</td>
<td>Apostle Shirley Johnson</td>
<td>889-2942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Interview Questions:

- Do you have any interests or ideas for your own development or other projects in the local community?
- Are you currently involved in affordable housing, economic development, community organizing, or any similar activities in your area?
- What challenges, needs, or opportunities do you see as priorities in your area?
- Do you have any information (such as data, or surveys) to help identify specific local needs, such as housing for people with special needs or low income?
- Do you know any other churches, organizations, leaders, or businesses, etc. who might be important partners, contacts, or resources in local projects?
- Are you part of any larger organizations, networks, or partnerships that might be helpful partners, contacts, or resources in local projects?
- What resources could you offer to help meet local needs like affordable housing?
  A) Physical/financial (such as land, funds, buildings, office space or equipment)
  B) Human skills/experience (such as construction or community organizing) C) Social (such as community outreach, meetings, or social services)
• What resources do you see Faithworks or other partners as contributing? (Such as research, development experience, political organizing or contacts)
• What do you see as challenges or issues affecting local community projects? A) Political (such as lack of representation, or rivalry between groups) B) Economic (such as lack of funding, or lack of investment from outside) C) other
• Do you think Faithwork’s goals are realistic or compatible with your own goals?
• Do you see any potential problems in working with Faithworks or other partners?
• Would you be interested in partnering with Faithworks or other partners?
• What next steps, if any, would you like to take with Faithworks or other partners (such as building partnerships, research, community organizing, or planning)?
• What are your goals for the community, or vision for the future of the area?
• Do you have any other comments, information, questions or suggestions?
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GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

PROJECT TITLE
Project DC: Community-based Research Internship with Faithworks

PROJECT DIRECTOR
Robert O. Boulter, President of Faithworks

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
Ashley Lancaster

TELEPHONE
(256)-683-9437

SPONSOR
Faithworks

The Georgetown University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved this research project. For information on your rights as a research subject, call the Institutional Review Board office at 202-687-1506.

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to consider participating in a research study to investigate the challenges associated with collaboratively working on community development. This form will describe the purpose and nature of the research, its possible risks and benefits, and your rights as a participant in the study. The decision to participate, or not to participate, is yours. If you decide to participate, please be sure to sign and date the last page of this form.

WHY IS THIS RESEARCH STUDY BEING DONE?

In this research study, we are investigating the conflicts that arise when trying to work in a collaborative effort to develop a community, primarily to establish affordable housing. In examining these problems, we hope to also come up with solid solutions, to help future groups who may be working on similar projects. The goal is that in coming up with solutions to these problems, it will make working in a group effort less difficult.

HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

About 10-15 pastors, and their churches primarily of the Anacostia community, will take part in this study. Participants in the study are referred to as “subjects.”

WHAT IS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY?

You will be contacted by phone at different times during the study to set up meetings. At these meetings we will primarily continue to discuss your goals or visions for the community, as well as the current status of the project, and any next steps that need to be taken. The overall timeline for the project is not certain, due to the fact that housing development is a long process. The timeline for the research concerning collaborative challenges in the pre-development phase of the project is about six months (November to May 2006). During the project you will interact primarily with Georgetown University partners and Faithworks representatives. This includes Robert Boulter, president of Faithworks; Sam Marullo, Professor of Sociology at Georgetown University; Sean Sanford, Georgetown University Student/Researcher; and Ashley Lancaster, Georgetown University Student/Researcher.

HOW LONG WILL I BE IN THE STUDY?

We expect that you will be in the study for at least six months. The research concerning the challenges of a group effort will take place during the next six months; however, the
portion of the project dealing directly with housing development has an uncertain time frame.

The investigators or sponsors may stop the study or take you out of the study at any time they judge it is in your best interest (e.g., if you experience an injury or if you do not comply with the study plan) or for a variety of other reasons. They can do this without your consent.

You can stop participating at any time. However, if you decide to stop participating in the study, we encourage you to talk to the researcher first.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF THE STUDY?

There are no known risks associated with this study.

WHAT ABOUT CONFIDENTIALITY?

Your name will not be used when data from this study are published.

Every effort will be made to keep your research records and other personal information confidential. However, we cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality.

Individuals from the Georgetown University IRB, other Georgetown University offices, Federal regulatory agencies, and Faithworks may look at records related to this study, both to assure quality control and to analyze data. Your name and any material that could identify you will remain confidential except as may be required by law.

We will take the following steps to keep information about you confidential, and to protect it from unauthorized disclosure, tampering, or damage: any written or recorded information will be kept in a password-protected database, and then stored under lock and key.

WILL I BE PAID FOR PARTICIPATING?

Study subjects will not be paid for participating in this study.

WHAT IF I GET INJURED DURING MY PARTICIPATION?

Researchers will make every effort to prevent study-related injuries. If you are injured or become ill while you are in the study, you will receive emergency medical care. The costs of this care will be charged to you or to your health insurer. No funds have been made available by Georgetown University or its affiliates, the District of Columbia, or the Federal government to compensate you for a study-related injury or illness.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT?
Participation in this study is entirely voluntary at all times. You have the right not to participate at all or to leave the study at any time. Deciding not to participate or choosing to leave the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled, and it will not harm your relationship with Georgetown University or any of its employees.

If you decide to leave the study, the procedure is: to contact the researcher immediately and inform him/her of your desire to withdraw from the study.

Throughout this study, researchers will tell you about new information related to the interventions in the study, interventions that may be appropriate for you, or any other information that may affect your interest in remaining in the study.

WHOM DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS?

Call Ashley Lancaster at 256-683-9437 during regular business hours if you have questions about the study, any problems, unexpected physical or psychological discomforts, any injuries, or think that something unusual or unexpected is happening.

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have fully explained this study to the subject. I have discussed the study’s purpose, its procedures, its possible risks and benefits, and the voluntary nature of participation. I have invited the subject to ask questions and have answered any questions that the subject has asked.

________________________________________  _______________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent      Date

Consent of Subject (or Legally Authorized Representative)

I have read the information provided in this Informed Consent Document (or it was read to me by ________________________________).

My questions were answered to my satisfaction.

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

________________________________________  _______________________
Signature of Subject      Date
Appendix F
(Notes from all interviews)

Notes From the November 22, 2005 meeting with Rev. Chambers of Young’s Memorial

- 2917 Knox Place SE—assessed value of $58,740 and proposed value of $70,520. Currently being used for parking? Would like to utilize this space for a daycare center?
• 2488 Alabama Ave.—10,000 sq. ft. assessed value of $42,500. Would like to develop a Family Life Center, or perhaps a charter school. (His vision for this charter school: “I was thinking about 3 or 4 stories high…if we do this, we need to do something different and intellectual. We have to bring quality and imagination if you want to appeal to the ‘gentrification people’.”) Potential university partner to assist with basic training programs.

• 2449/51? Angar? Place—would like to build a 45-50 unit senior Center, but currently has no concrete plans to do so.

• He would like to sell the property to the Young’s Memorial CDC (a church member run organization, but separate entity, so the church would still be involved and the money would still be brought back to the church) and create a LLC.

• Rev. Chambers described the community block grant fund as extremely political: “you learn your level and you live with that level”…”it’s all about who you know”…

• Currently working with Othello Mahone?—former director of the CDHD; however, they have not signed a contract.

• “We own all of the land [referring to the above mentioned properties]”—$60,000 debt on all of the land.

• Rev. Chambers attempted to get the church to move, however the congregation is committed to that particular community and wants to help ‘that’ community—despite being commuters (Congress Hts. Natives). The church’s role as the central point of the community is what Rev. Chambers is trying to re-establish.

• Vision: provide an all-round resource or haven for the community…”the black church is the hospital, the law office, the social clinic…” “because of gentrification you have blacks and whites moving in who don’t know about the black church [its traditional role in the community]”

• “the dynamics of ‘community’ have changed…mega-churches survive because they have many different venues…daycare, etc”

• “you can’t just teach one facet, [you need a] holistic approach to life…you must create a friendly environment”

• “only the church can give back a sense of self-esteem or belonging—these are basic needs of humanity” (this is a point that Rev. Chambers stressed repeatedly) “capitalism separates people” “charity made them wards of their own environment…dependent on charity”

• Made reference to ‘Ward 9’, which is located around the district, just inside the beltway—where people are displaced. They are promised renovation and are victims to increasing housing costs.

• Bob suggests pairing housing projects with Rev. Chambers’ desire to establish a senior center and a charter school, to support these endeavors.

• Next Step: Rev. Chambers is “tired of procrastinating” and “would want to develop a business plan” (MSB?)

• Rev. Chambers’ view on “affordable housing”: “I don’t believe in living on top of each other, that’s not humane” “density, despite economics, does not promote community” He stressed that “culture and economics of the people are key”.
November 22nd Meeting with Reverend Chambers in Interview Format

1. Do you have any interests or ideas for your own development or other projects in Congress Heights?

Most certainly; he wants to maintain Young Memorial Church #1’s standing in the community and support holistic ministry to parishioners and residents through projects like a dedicated parking lot (2917 Knox Place); 45 or more units of senior housing (2451 Ainger Place); a multi-purpose family/community center for drug therapy, culinary and other vocational training, and day care/elementary school; and even a new church at the current 2490 Alabama Avenue site.

2. Are you currently involved in affordable housing, economic development, community organizing, or any similar activities in this area?

Reverend Chambers #1 did have a $11 million redevelopment plan which was never carried out. There is also the affiliated Youngs Memorial Community Development Center, which exists to promote local community development in the areas of environmental justice, affordable/senior housing, job/skill training, child and senior day care, public health, welfare reform, and education. For example, it operates an 11-unit residential center for single mothers and children with AIDS under the larger RIGHT (Residing In Group House Together) Corporation at 209 Atlantic Street.

3. What challenges, needs, or opportunities do you see as priorities in this area?

Reverend Chambers #1 sees a great need to combat violence, poverty, drug abuse, and similar ills of the more inner-city, working-class African-American community in DC and Congress Heights particularly. These problems should be fought not just through specific programs like job training or drug therapy but through a more holistic development of the spiritual and psychological person, helping them belong to the church community and God.

At the same time, traditional African-American residents, especially the poor, are being neglected and even displaced with DC’s economic and housing boom and the influx of upper/middle-class black and white ‘yuppies’, with Prince George’s County become the unofficial ‘Ward 9’ of displaced lower-income African-Americans in violent, South African-style ‘townships’. As an example, more affluent African-American incomers in Congress Heights don’t respect Young Memorial Church #1 as an urban black church and community pillar, and the church has become marginalized in the surrounding community, with three Sunday services dropping to one and aggressive policing of church members’ parking.
To counter this, Reverend Chambers wants to develop facilities like the senior housing, parking lot, and community center that will provide for the church’s own needs and the infrastructure for job training, drug therapy, education/daycare and other aspects of its holistic human development mission. At the same time, this may make the church more relevant to affluent newcomers and help integrate the traditional and gentrified segments of the community.

What would you like to see happen at major sites like St. Elizabeth’s campus, Poplar Point, and Sheridan Terrace?

Although he didn’t focus directly on this issue, Reverend Chambers did seem opposed to exclusively for-profit development efforts that entailed gentrification and political entanglements and attempted to ‘wine and dine’ community leaders. He might support initiatives like the Community Land Trust or other elements of community-oriented development, but is more focused on issues local to Youngs Memorial in Congress Heights.

Do you have any information (such as data, or surveys) to help identify specific local needs, such as housing for people with special needs or low income?

Beyond personal experience with parishioners and their needs, he didn’t seem to have any specific information on special-needs populations.

Do you know of any other churches, organizations, leaders, or businesses, etc, who might be important partners, contacts, or resources in local projects?

Reverend Chambers mentioned informally consulting Othello Malone regarding development of the 2451 Ainger Place site for senior housing. He also mentioned the initiative by Robert Johnson of BET to provide money for black institutions that helped establish a shopping center near Southern Avenue and Parkview. Bob Boulter an developer acquaintance of his, whose son is active in community-development project combining self-supporting, profit-producing, and subsidized housing and other elements.

Are you part of any larger organizations, networks, or partnerships that might be helpful partners, contacts, or resources in local projects?

Reverend Chambers didn’t mention being part of any relevant organization.

What resources could you offer to help meet local needs like affordable housing?

Reverend Chambers noted several properties owned by Youngs Memorial Church, specifically 2917 Knox Place (13,083 square feet, currently $58,740, projected 2006 value $70,520); 2488 Alabama Avenue (10,736 square feet, $42,510) under Youngs Memorial Church Day Care Learning Center; and three additional properties along Ainger Place.

All of these properties are located immediately around the church at 2490 Alabama Avenue, and excluding the church lot itself (21,031 square feet, $705,060), property belonging to Youngs Memorial Church apparently totals 38,125 square feet, valued at $265,040 in 2005. It is notable that in 2003,
Reverend Chambers#1 says the property at 2488 Alabama Avenue was valued at $25,000, as opposed to $42,510 today. These properties are well-documented. Reverend Chambers#1 also mentioned that the church has only $60,000 debt, although there is a pending multi-million dollar lawsuit against the church, and he also admitted that paying Faithworks or other development partners might prove difficult.

b) Human skills/experience (such as construction or community organizing)
The CDC does exist, and would be used to buy and then redevelop properties from the church under a limited-liability corporation to maintain church control. It is also somewhat experienced in special-needs housing with the RIGHT, Inc, units for women and children with AIDS. Also, Reverend Chambers#1 appears to be relatively well-informed and connected on issues related to community development, for example with Othello Malone? and other informal contacts.

c) Social (such as community outreach, meetings, or social services)
One of Youngs MemorialChurch #1’s main social resources appears to be its congregation, which is committed to maintaining a strong, meaningful presence in the local area despite incentives to relocate to Maryland (many parishioners are commuters). Reverend Chambers#1 also seems confident in the effectiveness of existing social services like drug therapy and job training for parishioners, and the potential of future services like a top-notch daycare/charter elementary school providing Spanish, computer, and other classes. He even seems confident about bringing in possible outside partners, like universities to establish satellite schools for vocational and technical training or development-related contacts.

9 What resources do you see Faithworks or other partners as contributing? (Such as research, development experience, political organizing or contacts)
Reverend Chambers#1 sees the role of the CoRAL-Faithworks team as being first to fully evaluate physical and other assets, such as properties and congregant skills, and then to develop an effective business plan proposal for development projects. He would also appreciate pro bono assistance with the aforementioned lawsuit, which would help indirectly by reducing liabilities and distractions resulting from this case. He seems very receptive to any practical, business-oriented assistance or contacts, though not so much political organizing or contacts (see below).

10 What do you see as challenges or issues affecting local community projects? 
a) Political (such as lack of representation, or rivalry between groups)
Reverend Chambers#1 is skeptical towards affluent newcomer residents, police officers, and other supposed neighbors of the church; he perceives them as disrespecting or marginalizing Youngs Memorial Church #1, and he seems to view them as probable opponents of the church’s development projects. Similarly, he perceives a general movement to gentrify DC by displacing lower-income African-American residents and institutions, even a conspiracy as in the Federal
City Council’s supposed displacement policies. As a result, he refuses to accept community block grants or other ‘political entanglements’ that would diminish the integrity or independent agency of Youngs Memorial Church #1 or himself as pastor.

Reverend Chambers #1 also refuses to work with WIN, stating “I hate them” for their aggressive and demanding approach to organizing and politicking, similar to Jimmy Hoffa’s Teamsters Union. Altogether, it seems that Reverend Chambers #1 is wary of cooperation with other groups beyond practical business assistance.

b) Economic (such as lack of funding, or lack of investment from outside)
Although the church carries only a $60,000 debt, Reverend Chambers #1 did mention that the aforementioned lawsuit could cost the church millions of dollars and prove very entangling, although this supposedly wouldn’t affect development. He also implicitly admitted that paying Faithworks or other partners for development assistance might be difficult, and that he has a preference for finding low-bid or pro bono assistance.

c) Other
Reverend Chambers #1 did briefly mention reluctance among the congregation to commit to any specific, major development projects, although they are committed to thriving as an important institution in the community. Also, he is opposed to high density development as ‘stacking people like cattle’ and breeding crime and other problems, especially for lower-income residents in public housing.

11 Do you think Faithwork’s goals are realistic or compatible with your own goals?
Provided Faithworks’ proposes a medium-scale project to help Youngs Memorial Church #1 to develop facilities for its own community goals (rather than involving entangling political or organizational commitments, for example with District or Federal community block grants or WIN membership), Reverend Chambers #1 is enthusiastic about working with Faithworks, declaring himself “sold” on doing so.

12 Do you see any potential problems in working with Faithworks or other partners?
As mentioned, there might be some financial liabilities or inadequacies, and Reverend Chambers #1 seems opposed to any project entailing high density, entanglements with political affairs or other groups like WIN, too large or expensive for Youngs Memorial Church #1 to manage or not tailored to Youngs Memorial Church #1’s own development priorities.

13 What next steps, if any, would you like to take with Faithworks or other partners (such as building partnerships, research, community organizing, or planning)?
Faithworks needs to help Youngs Memorial Church #1 evaluate its physical, financial, and other assets, and provide an effective business proposal.
14 What are your goals for this area, or vision for the future of (community)?

Youngs Memorial Church #1’s holistic community services and facilities should ensure its importance in the community, help rejuvenate and reintegrate the lives of parishioners and residents, and help prevent gentrification and displacement.

12.08.05—Meeting with the North Capitol Ecumenical Council
Attendees: Pastor Streeter of Mt. Pleasant, Rev. Harris of St. Martin’s, Rev. Livingston of Mt. Bethel, Threee Pastors, Bob Boulter of Faithworks, Professor Marullo, Professor Cooke, Sean Sanford, and Ashley Lancaster of Georgetown University

The meeting was held at Mt. Pleasantone of the attending pastors’ church, located on the corner of 1st and Rhode Island, in the North Capitol community. The interview format was fairly informal and conversational, using the ‘interview questionnaire’ as a basic framework. My notes are in bullet format below—pastors’ responses are listed under corresponding interview prompts:

- Members of “The Council”: Metropolitan Wesley, St. Martin’s, Franklin United Methodist, Mt. Olive United Missionary, Mt. Bethel, St. George’s, and Mt. Pleasant

- Challenges/issues affecting local community projects:
  - “DC doesn’t like churches and poor people…”
  - “The ‘community’ doesn’t like the ‘community’…there is animosity between new people and old residents”
  - “There is a tension created between new and old residents—this is counterproductive”
  - “People are worried that affordable housing will bring their property values down, and they don’t want those types of people…”
  - “There are challenges in terms of making it affordable to stay in the city”
  - “What can we do w/ very little land, assets, etc.? How can we be engaged?”
  - “The door has closed for us in DC [in terms of affordable housing]”
  - “Does the District still have available properties? …I don’t think I could see the ‘Durham’ project working in this neighborhood…” [referencing the community land trust instated in Durham, NC]
  - “[I have] concerns with involvement with a project on lands owned by ‘outsiders’—will we truly be involved?”

- What challenges, needs, or opportunities do you see as priorities in your area?
  - “There is a great need for affordable housing, because working classes are literally being squeezed out.”
  - “The community came to us about the Gates School, [there was an interest] to create a senior center…”

- Role of Faithworks and the Georgetown Team:
  - Identifying physical parcels of land, as well as identifying ‘human resources’
• “If the research is done and we look at this information, that could be the momentum”
• **What resources could you offer to help meet needs like affordable housing?**
  • “The church has a lot of talented people. The leaders of these churches are really powerful in terms of the community”
• **Current involvement in affordable housing, economic development, community organizing, etc.?**
  • “We [St. Martin’s] took some people into the convent, provided support services, and now those people are working and looking for affordable housing”
• **Do you know of any other organizations which might be important partners, contacts, or resources in local projects?**
  • “Howard University is the biggest property owner in this area… We [St. Martin’s] use the former rectory as an outreach program for HU students…”

**February 15th Meeting with Pastor Garfield Burton at Macedonia Baptist**

Ashley Lancaster and I (Sean Sanford) met with Pastor Garfield Burton of Macedonia Baptist (2625 Stanton Road SE, 202-678-8486) on Wednesday evening, February 15th, 2006, following Pastor Burton’s response to my ‘cold call’ and his openness to a first meeting. In general, Pastor Burton was very friendly and open to sharing information, and seemed genuinely interested in helping bring affordable housing to the neighborhood, apparently for both Macedonia Baptist’s members and other local residents. He seemed to have considerable informal knowledge of housing- and development-related trends in the immediate area, such as current efforts to redevelop Sheridan Terrace, and contacts with fellow area pastors and other important individuals. At the same time, he admitted that “land is scarce” and that Macedonia Baptist had not acquired any substantial amount prior to the current prohibitively expensive real estate market. He is very open to working with Faithworks, and even other nearby churches, for affordable housing. Although this is only a personal, subjective impression, it seems he may even be willing to help with a greater effort, even if Macedonia Baptist itself can’t acquire any land.

For our part, Ashley and I described Faithworks’ general interest in finding resources and partners, especially faith-based and rooted in the local community, to build affordable housing and pursue other community development, and our ongoing research and organizing in this regard. We explained that Faithworks could provide various kinds of assistance for any organization wishing to participate in community development, from ‘bricks and mortar’ planning and construction, to building partnerships, to arranging financial leverage. We left some simple fact sheets and other examples of research findings for the Historic Anacostia community, although we failed to mention that Georgetown/Faithworks could also assist a church or other organization through research.

Original notes have been modified for the standard interview format below:
15 *Do you have any interests or ideas for your own development or other projects in the Anacostia area?*

*Pastor Burton#3* is interested in building affordable housing for church members and local residents, if land could be found, a difficult prospect. Also, the church has plans to develop its vacant property into a parking lot (see below).

16 *Are you currently involved in affordable housing, economic development, community organizing, or any similar activities in this area?*

The church is helping to subsidize one member’s $200,000 Hunter Place condo, so as to help at least one family maintain ‘affordable housing’. More importantly, *Pastor Burton#3* has proposed to his congregation in the past that they purchase some of the older, and especially some of the newer townhouse units being built in the area, as transitional housing for those displaced from existing homes or awaiting new housing. However, this was never pursued, and as a consequence the church has not purchased any such housing units or land prior to current skyrocketing real estate prices. *Pastor Burton#3* does have strong contacts with pastors at Bethlehem Baptist and Matthews Memorial Baptist church? and church?, both nearby, important churches originally descended from *Macedonia Baptist Church #3*.

17 *What challenges, needs, or opportunities do you see as priorities in this area?*

*Pastor Burton#3*’s greatest challenge seems to be affordable housing: to begin with, “land is scarce” in his immediate area, with much of what is available already claimed and accumulated by other parties, typically private developers. For example, at one point the church had owned some land immediately across the street at Stanton Road, which was then swapped for properties adjacent to the church on its own side of the road with the owner’s grandson. This grandson, a shrewd businessman, has held his land, and is planning 16 units of housing—unlikely to be ‘affordable’ in *Pastor Burton#3*’s opinion—but has delayed actual development until real estate prices and thus profit margins are at their highest.

Similarly, a number of new condo developments have been built in the area, either on vacant land or by renovating existing townhouses and apartments, and their had even been an attempt at this condo-conversion at the nearby Washington View Apartments on Douglas Road. *Pastor Burton#3* feels that the ‘temporary displacement’ of residents for this renovation—standard procedure—would have become permanent due to the increase price of renovated condos. Fortunately, such conversion and displacement didn’t occur on this occasion, but *Pastor Burton#3* is concerned that it is growing difficult to find a two-bedroom ‘condo’ for less than $200,000 in the neighborhood, and that lower-income residents will lack affordable housing.

*Pastor Burton#3* is even concerned that the church, ideally located by wooded hills and near currently renovating condo developments as well as Sheridan Terrace, might be approached or pursued with offers of a buy-out of its land, although this has not yet occurred at *Macedonia Baptist Church #3* (perhaps
potential private developers have ‘overlooked’ Macedonia Baptist Church #3 to this point?

18 Do you know of any other churches, organizations, leaders, or businesses, etc., who might be important partners, contacts, or resources in local projects? Pastor Burton #3 emphasized several times that ‘we [Georgetown] should talk to Reverend Coates’ at Bethlehem Baptist?, as Reverend Coates is an important leader in the local community, has dealt repeatedly with parties such as Toyota and William C. Smith who seek to redevelop part or all of Sheridan Terrace, has ambitious plans for residential and retail development on Bethlehem Baptist’s own extensive property, and could even be a potential leader for any network of churches in the vicinity of the Howard Road & MLK Avenue intersection.

Bethlehem Baptist? was originally an offshoot of Macedonia Baptist Church #3, itself started 150 years ago and thus the oldest African-American church in Anacostia; as such, Pastor Burton #3 seems to have strong ties to Reverend Coates, although this was not explicitly stated. Similarly, Matthews Memorial? is another ‘offspring’ of Macedonia Baptist Church #3 and was mentioned as a potentially important contact, although no explicit relationship between Matthews Memorial? and Macedonia Baptist Church #3 was mentioned. Pastor Burton #3 also mentioned a definite relationship with Reverend Bonner at Saint John’s CME, on 2801 Stanton Road?

Finally, one church member was (very briefly) mentioned as being involved with Habitat for Humanity, although Pastor Burton #3 didn’t elaborate on specific details, and Deaconess Bess Newell? is currently working with the private development firm William C. Smith on the Sheridan Terrace property, working towards her real estate license; this could be a potential contact with William C. Smith, if any useful cooperation could be conceived with William C. Smith, and if Deaconess Newell? was willing to act in this fashion.

19 What resources could you offer to help meet local needs like affordable housing?
   a) Physical/financial (such as land, funds, buildings, office space or equipment)
Although “land is scarce”, Macedonia Baptist Church #3 does have some property, principally a large vacant area immediately adjacent, which the church has attempted but not succeeded in developing as parking space, prevented by District government regulations (see below). At least potentially, this land could be used for community as well as congregation parking, if regulations allow and Macedonia Baptist Church #3 is willing to share, or even for small-scale housing (ie one or two townhouses). However, Pastor Burton #3 did not mention any potential housing development on this property, although he seems possible amenable to sharing any available parking space.

The church also has several adjacent building, which serve as administrative offices and classrooms. No other resources were mentioned at this time.
b) Human skills/experience (such as construction or community organizing)
Although when directly asked, Pastor Burton#3 said he was ‘unaware’ of any members who could represent human resources for development in the form of skills or experience, he had mentioned Deaconess Bess Newell’s work with William C. Smith and imminent real estate license, which may prove useful. Also, the one unnamed member who works with Habitat for Humanity could potentially provide some useful expertise or contacts, although at the moment no specifics are known concerning her experience. Finally, many more members with useful skills and experience might be found upon further investigation.

c) Social (such as community outreach, meetings, or social services)
Every year the church hosts “Community Day”, essentially a picnic for residents, at which the church donates food baskets, school supplies, and other gifts. One interesting activity is a program in which church members pay down their credit cards to $600 of debt, donate this amount to the church, and then the church relieves members of this debt and cuts up the credit cards in a bowl at the altar.

20 What resources do you see Faithworks or other partners as contributing? (Such as research, development experience, political organizing or contacts)
When mentioned, Pastor Burton#3 remarked that help arranging financial assistance for any development, and planning support for any development, would certainly be welcome from Faithworks. Most importantly, Pastor Burton#3 seemed interested in any assistance with acquiring land, which is so scarce, for affordable housing.

21 What do you see as challenges or issues affecting local community projects? 
   a) Political (such as lack of representation, or rivalry between groups)
A major political challenge for Macedonia BaptistChurch #3, as mentioned, is the force of District regulations, preventing development from the one lot of vacant property that Macedonia BaptistChurch #3 does own into parking space. Requirements for extra drainage (beyond that existing for adjacent streets) would reduce remaining area for parking space until there is essentially no point in development, judging by planning schema Pastor Burton#3 showed, produced by the District itself.

   b) Economic (such as lack of funding, or lack of investment from outside)
The major economic challenge is, of course, the fact that “land is scarce”. With extensive land acquisition, development, and condo-conversion occurring all around Macedonia BaptistChurch #3, the church has been unable to acquire any meaningful lots of land for development, beyond the lot for potential parking which is obstructed as mentioned above. This is exacerbated by the fact that the going rate for two-bedroom ‘condos’ (ie converted apartments) is $200,000. Also, Macedonia BaptistChurch #3 would presumably have difficulty in fully financing any
development project on its own.

22 Do you think Faithwork’s goals are realistic or compatible with your own goals?
   Although this was only an introductory meeting, Pastor Burton#3 does seem genuinely interested in affordable housing and ‘really helping people’ in the neighborhood generally. However, Macedonia Baptist Church #3 itself does not possess any considerable real estate property; unless it can acquire some of that “scarce” land, it may only be able to work with Faithworks in other ways, eg as part of a local interfaith network.

23 Would you be interested in partnering with Faithworks or other partners?
   At this point, Pastor Burton#3 is definitely interested in partnering with Faithworks and even other churches on affordable housing and community issues. In particular, Pastor Burton#3 mentioned being ‘willing to find another way’ for Macedonia Baptist Church #3 to acquire land or get involved in affordable housing.

24 What next steps, if any, would you like to take with Faithworks or other partners (such as building partnerships, research, community organizing, or planning)?
   Pastor Burton#3 wants to meet again in the future to continue sharing information and finding ways to get involved in affordable housing.

25 Do you have any other comments, information, questions or suggestions?
   The main points seem to be that “land is scarce” and as a consequence it is crucial to hold onto any land which appears available; that cooperation may be possible between Macedonia, Matthews Memorial, Bethlehem, and other nearby churches; and that Macedonia Baptist Church #3 is willing to find some way of helping the project.
## Appendix G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Interpretation or Definition</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any interests or ideas for your own development or other projects in the local community?</td>
<td>‘yes’ or ‘no’, or specifically describing the interest/idea</td>
<td>‘yes’ indicates an existing interest/idea for development, ‘no’ indicates no interest/idea</td>
<td>Three ‘yes’ responses from all three interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you currently involved in affordable housing, economic development, community organizing, or any similar activities in your area?</td>
<td>‘yes’ or ‘no’, or specifically describing the involvement</td>
<td>‘yes’ indicates some sort of involvement, ‘no’ indicates no involvement</td>
<td>Three ‘yes’ responses from all interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges, needs, or opportunities do you see as priorities in your area?</td>
<td>Housing, education/school, senior citizens</td>
<td>‘housing’ indicates a need for affordable housing, ‘education’ indicates a need for improvement in the education realm, ‘senior citizens’ indicates a need for resources geared toward helping this group</td>
<td>Three ‘housing’ responses from all three interviewees, one ‘education/school’ response, one ‘senior citizens’ response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any information (such as data or surveys) to help identify specific local needs, such as housing for people with special needs or low income?</td>
<td><em>NA</em></td>
<td><em>NA</em></td>
<td><em>NA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know of any other churches, organizations, etc. who might be important partners, contacts, or resources in local projects?</td>
<td>School, church</td>
<td>‘school’ indicates that the interviewee named a local university as a potential partner, ‘church’ indicates that the</td>
<td>One ‘school’ response, one ‘church’ response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you part of any larger organizations, networks, or partnerships that might be helpful partners, contacts or resources in local projects?</td>
<td><em>Yes</em> or <em>No</em></td>
<td><em>Yes</em> indicates some sort of involvement with an outside entity, that may be relevant to this project. <em>No</em> indicates no involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What resources could you offer to help meet needs like affordable housing? a) physical/financial b) human skills/experience c) social</td>
<td><em>Member</em>, <em>Intangible</em>, <em>Leadership</em></td>
<td><em>Member</em> indicates that a member of a church has some sort of training/experience that may be helpful. <em>Intangible</em> indicates something that is not physical, i.e. commitment to the project. <em>Leadership</em> indicates the influential role of the pastor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What resources do you see Faithworks or other partners as contributing?</td>
<td><em>Research</em>, <em>Connection</em>, <em>Know-how</em></td>
<td><em>Research</em> indicates physical research capabilities, i.e. asset mapping, etc. <em>Connection</em> indicates FW’s match-making abilities—that is, putting churches in contact with appropriate groups to assist in the process. <em>Know-how</em> indicates an understanding or knowledge of the process of developing affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. What do you see as challenges or issues affecting local community projects? a) political b) economic c) other</strong></td>
<td><em>Political</em>, <em>Land</em>, <em>Value</em>, <em>Rapid Change</em></td>
<td><em>Political</em> indicates the lack of representation, rivalry between groups, reference to gentrification as a political tool to displace, also reference to not knowing the right people. <em>Land</em> indicates lack of available land to develop on. <em>Value</em> indicates a concern that affordable housing will drive properties down. <em>Rapid change</em> indicates the rate at which developers not interested in affordable housing development are coming into neighborhoods. <em>Resistance</em> indicates the hesitancy of current community residents to support the development of affordable housing units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Do you see any potential problems in working with Faithworks or other partners?</strong></td>
<td><em>Interests</em>, <em>Motive</em></td>
<td><em>Interests</em> indicates a concern that there may be varying interests. <em>Motive</em> indicates a concern about why a group may be involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Do you think Faithworks’ goals are realistic or compatible with your own goals?</strong></td>
<td><em>Yes</em> or <em>No</em></td>
<td><em>Yes</em> indicates that the goals are realistic or compatible. <em>No</em> indicates that the goals are not perceived as realistic or compatible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response 1</td>
<td>Response 2</td>
<td>Response 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Would you be interested in partnering with Faithworks or other partners?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What next steps, if any, would you like to take with Faithworks or other partners?</td>
<td>research, business</td>
<td>research indicates the desire for GJ to conduct more research specific to the geographic region of a particular church, i.e. available land</td>
<td>Three 'research' responses One 'business' response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What are your goals/visions for the future community?</td>
<td>parking, housing, environment</td>
<td>parking indicates the need for more parking spaces—a parking lot</td>
<td>Three 'parking' responses Three 'housing' responses One 'environment' response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you have any other comments, information, questions or suggestions?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA denotes that this information is not available due to sensitivity, or perhaps the lack of a response

**These questions are most pertinent to my research**
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