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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2005, the FireStar Initiative (FireStar) was established in collaboration with the Stardust Foundation, United Phoenix Firefighters Association, Valley of the Sun United Way, City of Phoenix Fire Department, the City of Phoenix Mayor’s Office, and other community partners. The mission of the FireStar is to "improve the lives of people and communities in the Phoenix-metro region, who are in social and economic distress."

This unique approach to community building involves volunteer resources of the United Phoenix Firefighters Association and their connections with other organizations and resources within the Phoenix metropolitan area to conduct revitalization efforts in a specific community. FireStar investments have thus far been made in two different neighborhoods, each located within the Maryvale community of west Phoenix.

This report presents the results of a community assessment for a third community – comprised of portions of the Central City South neighborhoods within the Central City South area of Central Phoenix. Specifically, the community is bounded on the east and west by 7th Street and 15th Avenue and on the north and south by Grant Street and Interstate 17.

Valley of the Sun United Way (VSUW) and FireStar partners selected Central City South as the next community for FireStar investment based on a variety of factors, such as the presence of local, established leadership; the ability to leverage investments by other funders being made in the neighborhood; and various data that indicated this community could benefit from additional support.

Another primary factor for the selection of Central City South was VSUW’s longstanding involvement in the community. VSUW has been funding partner agencies in Central City South since 1940, and continues its strong engagement in the community today. In addition to its continued funding of programs and agencies in the area, it is expanding engagement by incorporating other investment strategies. For example, VSUW is creating new “Targeted Approach” Strategy, which focuses on developing early childhood and youth services around area schools, and on funding child care centers to help achieve its community objective of Ensuring Children and Youth Succeed. Other activities such as injury prevention programs (specifically, smoke alarm awareness and education), have recently been infused into the area as a result of targeted grants made to VSUW. There was realization that by further adding investments from FireStar, the Central City South community could be further propelled toward its ideal of becoming a vibrant place for families and individuals to live, work, and play - a core mission of VSUW. All of these efforts center on VSUW's overarching goal of its targeted investments, specifically to ensure children and youth succeed, increase financial stability of individuals and families, and ending hunger and homelessness.

The purpose of this assessment is to help the Neighborhood Advocacy Team that has been assembled for this initiative to strategize and prioritize FireStar investments.

The assessment report, contracted by VSUW and produced by the Partnership for Community Development (PCD) of Arizona State University, was built upon seven distinct methodologies:
Community Vital Signs Assessment – To provide a comprehensive socio-demographic and economic review of the community. The review was completed in a way that profiles its health and vitality along core indicators available from secondary data sources, including census data.

Review of Past Studies in Central Phoenix – Over the past decade, numerous studies have been completed that highlight the assets, challenges, and aspirations of residents and organizations in and around the identified community. The assessment summarizes and synthesizes the results of these past studies in a way that illuminates the character, voices, and inspirations of the community.

Community Conversations – At the request of community stakeholders, the PCD did not create a new wave of community conversations, focus groups, community-based meeting participation, and/or town hall methodologies that are characteristic of its normal assessment activities. Instead, the assessment draws upon insights from past community conversation activities, including the recently completed Central City South Quality of Life Plan. General themes emerging from these community conversations, which are a mixture of challenges and opportunities, include land use, housing, neighborhood beautification, circulation and transportation, economic development, job training, child care, environment, public safety, recreation, health, human service support systems, and community pride.

Key Informant Research – In depth interviews were conducted with representatives of sixteen organizations that either work directly within the community or with other metropolitan neighborhoods of similar character. These key informants provided reflections on what guidelines, processes or outcomes might be important to consider in light of the history of past investments in the community, and the challenges within the community. Nine key themes emerged, summarized in the assessment. Twelve core challenges are also summarized, along with reflections on the potentially unique roles that firefighters might play as partners in the community building process.

Community Asset Mapping – The assessment offers a comprehensive inventory of existing assets within the community, including educational organizations, faith communities, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, businesses, service clubs and other community-based organizations. The inventory reveals that there is a preponderance of human, programmatic, and organizational assets around which to build new investments in the neighborhood.

Review of National Literature and Best Practices – The assessment includes a review of nationally recognized “best practices” for community development. It also provides a tutorial on the basic precepts of the Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) model, and suggests its implications for shaping the character of FireStar investments in the community. Furthermore, the national community development “assessment and indicators” literature is reviewed, and assembled into a Healthy Communities Model that will serve as a scientifically valid platform for framing FireStar investments around the needs and aspirations of the community.

Action Planning and Priority-Setting Process – The assessment describes the process that the Neighborhood Advocacy Team will utilize to establish investment priorities based upon the results of the assessment process. These priorities will be summarized in a subsequent edition of this report.

The implementation process will be catalyzed through Friendly House, a partner agency of VSUW since 1940. Friendly House is a community-based organization that has provided community services and development initiatives to Central City South, and it will serve as the Collaborative Partner for FireStar in Central City South. Friendly House will coordinate FireStar activities that involve multiple partners in
the planning and implementation of the FireStar action plan. These partners include Stardust Foundation, United Phoenix Firefighters Association, City of Phoenix Fire Department, City of Phoenix Mayor's Office, JP Morgan Chase, and other community partners.

Through the FireStar investments, the stage is being set for resident-driven process of community transformation that is both sustainable and focused on community aspirations. The success of this endeavor rests upon its simultaneous focus on both process and outcomes. Not only is it important that program implementation is long term and sustainable, but also that residents and community-based organizations work together to avoid replication, leverage resources, and better communicate the services available to the community. Toward that end, the report concludes with four significant “lessons learned” from the assessment process to guide FireStar investment decisions:

- Healthy and sustainable communities are built by empowering the residents and organizations within the community - not by outside organizations doing something for the community.
- Effective community development is accomplished by long-term investments in structural change - not by short-term investments intended to “clean up” community "problems."
- Effective community development happens when many sectors work together in partnership.
- Sustainable community development is achieved when residents are personally engaged in the community development process and implement their own solutions.

This community assessment documents the quality of life possibilities for Central City South and the potential role of FireStar investments in affecting positive change within the community. With the goals for FireStar investments clearly established, and anchored in the community vision, the impact will be profound and enduring. Collaborative action and leadership among the residents is needed to focus the community’s assets on achieving self-sufficiency for Central City South. There is much work to do, but the rewards will be great. The resources exist solely to help make a difference in the lives of Central City South residents and to bolster the vitality of its organizations and institutions. The potential accomplishments can make a lasting impression that will continue to help Central City South attain its ideal quality of life over generations to come.
INTRODUCTION

History of the FireStar Initiative

The FireStar Initiative (FireStar) was established in 2005 as a collaboration between the Stardust Foundation, the United Phoenix Fire Association, Valley of the Sun United Way (VSUW), the Phoenix Fire Department, the City of Phoenix Mayor’s Office and other community partners. The mission of FireStar is to “improve the lives of people and communities in the Phoenix-metro region, who are in social and economic distress.” To carry out this mission, FireStar has established three goals:

1. To assist community members encountered by firefighters with unanticipated emergency situations through an Emergency Assistance Program.
2. To provide opportunities to assist community issues in selected fire station service areas through a Community Building Program.
3. To add a new dimension to existing firefighter charity programs by providing a focus on community building activities.

This community assessment is one of a series of assessments that pertain to a sub-component of Objective 2 – establishing a Community Building Program. As specified in FireStar’s prospectus, Community Building funds are to be used to identify, target, and improve a local neighborhood by focusing and utilizing services from a wide variety of providers including community members, schools, faith-based, social service, government, and business representatives. Assessments such as these provide the basis for determining how this Objective can be effectively accomplished.

The first neighborhood selected for FireStar investment was Phoenix’s Maryvale Village, identified in 2005. Geographically, it is bounded between 51st Avenue to 67th Avenue (east to west) and Indian School Road to Osborn Road (north to south). The community assessment was completed in 2006, and guided FireStar investments in that neighborhood through 2008. (See Building the Community Health of Maryvale Village, A Roadmap for FireStar Investment, ASU Partnership for Community Development, Richard C. Knopf, John Burk, and Renae V. Tenney).

The second neighborhood selected for FireStar investment was Phoenix’s Golden Gate community, selected in 2007. Geographically, it is bounded by 35th to 43rd Avenues (east to west) and Thomas Road to Van Buren Avenue (north to south). The community assessment was completed in 2007, and continues to guide FireStar investments in that community. (See Building a Healthy Community: Investing in the Golden Gate Neighborhood, A FireStar Fund Community Scan, ASU Partnership for Community Development, John Burk, Richard C. Knopf, Laurie Pierce, Jessica Sturgess, and Chelsea Martin-Roethele).

The third neighborhood selected for FireStar investment is Phoenix’s Central City South, selected in 2008 – the focal neighborhood for this community assessment. Geographically, it is bounded by 7th Street to 15th Avenue (east to west) and Grant to the I-17 Freeway (north to south). The community includes two square miles of a primarily residential and small business area south of the core downtown area of Phoenix. Figure 1 shows the boundaries for this neighborhood.
Figure 1. Central City South Map
(As defined by Partnership for Community Development)

Building a Strong and Healthy Central City South

As with all previously-selected communities, the strategy in Central City South is to utilize resources to assemble new and existing partnerships, organizations, programs, volunteers, and local citizenry to develop a collaborative approach to community development that reflects the desires of the community.

VSUW and FireStar partners selected Central City South as the next community for FireStar investment based on a variety of factors, such as the presence of local, established leadership; the ability to leverage investments by other funders being made in the neighborhood; and various data that indicated this community could benefit from additional support.

Another primary factor for the selection of Central City South was VSUW’s longstanding involvement in the community. VSUW has been funding partner agencies in Central City South since 1940, and continues its strong engagement in the community today. In addition to its continued funding of programs and agencies in the area, it is expanding engagement by incorporating other investment strategies. For example, VSUW is creating new “Targeted Approach” Strategy, which focuses on developing early childhood and youth services around area schools, and on funding child care centers to help achieve VSUW’s community objective of Ensuring Children and Youth Succeed. Other activities such as injury prevention programs (specifically, smoke alarm awareness and education), have recently been infused into the area as a result of targeted grants made to VSUW. There was realization that by further adding investments from FireStar, the Central City South community could be further propelled toward its ideal of becoming a vibrant place for families and individuals to live, work, and play - a core mission of VSUW. All of these efforts center on VSUW’s overarching goal of its targeted investments, specifically to ensure children and youth succeed, increase financial stability of individuals and families, and ending hunger and homelessness.
The Central City South community is a cluster of eight small neighborhoods: IG Homes Neighborhood, New Homes Neighborhood, Matthew Henson Neighborhood, 7-11 Neighborhood, Grant Park Neighborhood, Marcos De Niza Neighborhood, and two unnamed neighborhoods extending from Central Avenue to 7th Street. Approximately 16,000 residents and about 90 businesses call these neighborhoods their home. The residents come from very diverse backgrounds (Hispanic, White, Black, American Indian, Asian and others) and disproportionately carry high levels of poverty and other social and economic challenges.

Yet for all of the challenges, Central City South has amazing potential. Many community organizations, working arm in arm with neighborhood residents and small businesses, are creating pathways for empowerment. Fresh visions for the community are being developed, strategic plans are being crafted, and plans for new neighborhood programs are being designed. In this repertoire of visions, FireStar investments hold great potential for aligning with other strategic initiatives to propel the community forward in its vision.

The collaborative partners of FireStar (United Phoenix Firefighters Association, Stardust Foundation, VSUW, City of Phoenix Fire Department, and City of Phoenix Mayor’s Office) have committed resources over the course of a three-year period to assist the residents of Central City South in their efforts to build a strong and healthy community. Equally of importance, the United Phoenix Firefighters has pledged the volunteer resources of its members to assist in these revitalization efforts. These assets, coupled with the connections the Association has with other organizations and resources within the Phoenix metropolitan area, hold great promise for the aspirations of Central City South residents.

The implementation process will be catalyzed through Friendly House, a partner agency of VSUW since 1940. Friendly House is a community-based organization that has provided community services and development initiatives to Central City South, and it will serve as the Collaborative Partner for FireStar in Central City South. Friendly House will coordinate FireStar activities that involve multiple partners in the planning and implementation of the FireStar action plan. These partners include Stardust Foundation, United Phoenix Firefighters Association, City of Phoenix Fire Department, City of Phoenix Mayor’s Office, JP Morgan Chase, and other community partners.

If the FireStar investments in the community are to be successful and enduring, they must be based upon a model of effective community building. Effective community building happens when investments are made into a neighborhood’s strengths (or assets) rather than simply focusing these investments on eliminating a neighborhood’s weaknesses. Toward this end, this assessment is oriented to discovering ways in which the financial and human resource investments of FireStar can provide an asset-building strategy that will maximize its positive and sustainable impact for the Central City South community.

Toward this end, this community assessment was anchored in the Asset-Based Community Development model. Through this assessment, visions and assets of the community were identified, and ideas for moving the community toward its ideals were assembled through a variety of methodologies.

In October of 2010, the results of this assessment were presented to the Neighborhood Advocacy Team, a committee charged with determining and prioritizing the specific forms of FireStar investments that will be made in the neighborhood. The Neighborhood Advocacy Team was organized in September of 2010, and contains representatives from a variety of community stakeholders and collaborative partners.
from the education, government, business, faith-community, and non-profit sectors. The Neighborhood Advocacy Team was charged with six tasks:

- To receive the results of this community assessment
- To consider the merits of alternative strategies, which includes results from other community development efforts, for FireStar investment in light of assessment results
- To prioritize strategies that would best move the community toward its expressed ideals
- To assist in implementation of program strategies by gathering collaborative partners
- To assist in the development of outcome assessments
- To monitor program outcomes over time

Arizona State University’s Partnership for Community Development (PCD) was commissioned by VSUW to conduct the community assessment and present results to the Neighborhood Advocacy Team. This initial report provides an overview of the results of the assessment process, and will be updated to include the recommendations of the Neighborhood Advocacy Team once they become formulated.

**ASU Partnership for Community Development**

The mission of the ASU Partnership for Community Development is to build multi-sector partnerships to address life quality issues within Arizona communities. The PCD builds innovative partnerships among business, government organizations, non-profit organizations, faith communities, and community service groups – not only to solve social challenges, but to help communities achieve their vision. The goal of the PCD is to help shape a strong and healthy quality of life in all communities – within metropolitan Phoenix and statewide. Through all of its activities, the PCD has focused on implementing the Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) methodology (see Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993, Green & Haines, 2002) – a process for empowering community members to define vision, mobilize resources to accomplish this vision, counter social challenges, and increase their quality of life. The Partnership used the ABCD model during the community assessment process and in the production of this report.

**Asset-Based Community Development Model**

Under the Asset-Based Community Development model, communities are envisioned as having a repertoire of assets. The role of an outside resource (such as FireStar) is to work with the community to identify these assets as resources for growth. If the outside resource is to be effective in enhancing life quality, it does not simply introduce programs or inject financial resources into the community. This serves only to create community reliance on the outside resource, as once the outside resource is removed the impacts dissipate. A more effective role of an outside resource is to “empower” that community to establish its own vision of an ideal, and then to help the community manage its assets to achieve its ideal. It does so by helping residents of a community take stock of the community’s assets, working with the community to assemble those assets into self-generating processes for producing growth, overcoming obstacles, and achieving their self-determined goals.

Under this perspective, People are seen as the source of solutions to what a community wants (as opposed to programs being seen as the source of solutions to what a community needs). Community organizations are seen as the vehicles for assembling community assets – not outside agencies that only
offer *programs*. If these community organizations are empowered, the impacts are sustainable. If reliance on outside agencies is produced, the impacts disappear when their programs disappear.

In short, the “ABCD approach” produces better results in helping residents build strong and healthy neighborhoods than the more commonly used “needs-driven” approach. Key differentiating features of the two approaches are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Differences between asset-building and needs-driven approaches to community development.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset-Building Model</th>
<th>Needs-Driven Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on ASSETS</td>
<td>Focus on NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds from OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td>Responds to PROBLEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT Orientation</td>
<td>CHARITY Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal is EMPOWERMENT</td>
<td>Goal is SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS</td>
<td>Emphasis on AGENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are CITIZENS</td>
<td>People are CLIENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE are the Answer</td>
<td>PROGRAMS are the Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help comes from RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>Help comes from CREDENTIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts are SUSTAINABLE</td>
<td>Impacts DISAPPEAR with Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the FireStar investments in Central City South, the most successful strategy will be to follow an asset-based approach. While the FireStar investment process could well be helpful in organizing some short-term programs *for* the community, it will produce more sustainable impacts by working *with* the community to assemble its own assets in ways that will move the community forward utilizing long-term outcomes.

Thus, to provide maximum effectiveness, a FireStar investment should be built upon the following ABCD principles:

- Gifts abound within the community. Gifts exist among individual citizens, neighborhood organizations, businesses, faith communities, schools, and non-profit organizations. These gifts must be discovered, and gift-giving opportunities must be offered. Strong communities know that there is unrecognized capacity and assets in every neighborhood, and that all gifts must be cultivated, acknowledged, and valued.

- All people and organizations care about something. People in neighborhoods are motivated to act about things that concern them. If provided with the right opportunities, people will respond and solve problems on their own.

- Relationships build a community. One of the central challenges for investment will be to constantly work in collaborations to build and re-build the relationships between and among local residents, local associations, and local institutions.

- People from outside of the community, who want to help must work *with* the people living and working in the community – not *for* them. The development strategy must concentrate on building the problem-solving capacities of local residents, local associations, and local institutions. It must focus on encouraging hope, control, and resourcefulness from within – as opposed to developing dependency on people and resources external to the community. Assistance that encourages reliance on external resources will only result in the waning of
accomplishments when the resources are removed. Assistance that leads to relationship building and the blossoming of internal assets results in perpetual processes of growth.

**How Does the ABCD Process Work?**

The professional literature on how to build strong and healthy communities through the ABCD process is voluminous. Yet, at its core, the literature suggests that the process of effective community development involves six essential components (see Figure 1 – adapted from Green & Haines, 2002). While each component can be understood as an independent element in the process, each element informs the other, and a process of inter-connected relations happens to move a community forward.

![ABCD Community Building Process](image)

**Figure 2. Core Components of an Effective ABCD Community Building Process (Adapted from Green and Haines, 2002).**

Briefly, the six components of ABCD-based community building are:

**Strategic Community Engagement.** In this element, the focus is on developing broad scale participation of residents and community organizations in the community building activities. There is an intentional strategy to value and involve all residents regardless of interests, ages and backgrounds. Similarly, there is an intentional strategy to involve all organizations regardless of mission, interests, or focus. Organizations include those with anchors or roots in the community, including non-profits, government agencies, educational institutions, advocacy groups, neighborhood associations, faith communities, and businesses. Efforts are made to help the community clarify issues and to build communication networks among all residents and organizations.

**Community Visioning.** The community creates a vision of where it wants to be in the future. A visioning process establishes a desired end state for the community, a vision of the future toward which it wishes to strive. A critical feature of the visioning process is the notion that the community can not only *design*
its own future, but create it themselves. In the context of community development, visioning processes typically focus on generating answers to three fundamental questions: (1) what do people want to maintain or preserve within their neighborhood, (2) what do people want to create in their neighborhood (features that may not exist now), and (3) what do people want to change in their community? Answers to these questions set a destiny around which strategic action can be organized.

**Identifying Community Assets.** Here, the notion is that effective community development happens when assets are mobilized to move the community toward its vision. Assets can be understood as existing in three contexts. First, there are the assets of individuals within the community. Each resident is understood to have a gift that can be utilized to grow the community toward its desired state. A particular senior citizen can have the ability and skill set to tutor a high school student in math and therefore increase his capacity to secure a higher paying job for that student. A high school student can have the ability to pay a visit to a home-bound senior for the purpose of conversation and encouragement, and discover that the senior has amazing artistic skills that she would be willing to share with other students in the neighborhood. Second, there are the assets of associations, organizations and informal kinship networks in the community – such as parent-teacher-student organizations, service clubs, recreation clubs, block watch groups, and the like. Individually, these associations, organizations and social networks have much to offer to community development – but are often disconnected with each other, and therefore under-developed relative to their capacity. Third, there are the institutions within the community – such as schools, non-profit organizations, government agencies, businesses, and faith communities. Individually, these institutions have tremendous resources to offer to the community, but they also tend to be disconnected from another. They often are not aligned in the context of serving a common vision for the community. The ultimate quest of community building activities is to organize all these assets (individual, social, and institutional) into a coherent and synergized whole – all for the purpose of bringing focus to the initiatives that the community deem to be most important. There are also assets that are external to a community – ABCD-related expertise within government agencies, non-profits, foundations, educational systems, and businesses. Under the ABCD process, strategies are developed to help residents gain access to these resources.

**Strategic Action Planning.** In this element, an action plan is developed to provide a road map of how the desired vision will be achieved by mobilizing the identified assets. Put another way, an action plan is the description of the activities needed to move the community toward its vision. It answers the following questions: what needs to be done, what assets must be mobilized to accomplish this success, how will success be measured, who is responsible for accomplishing success, and when will it be done? They can range from very specific actions (such as organizing a neighborhood cleanup day) to very comprehensive neighborhood development plans (such as developing new streetscapes and parks). Specific benchmarks and indicators need to be established for each action item – so progress can be monitored and success can be gauged. Strategies need to be developed for bonding and bridging assets within the community, and making linkages to resources external to the community. Action plans should be prepared that are based upon agreed-on strategies and goals established through broad-based community visioning processes.

**Implement Action.** This component describes the phase where the strategic (ABCD-anchored) action plans identified above are implemented. As they are implemented, as much emphasis must be placed on building relationships among community residents, organizations, and institutions as upon achieving tangible outcomes desired by the strategic action. In the ABCD-related literature, this is often referred to as building the social capital of a community (Mattesich 2009). Research has shown that there is
nothing more important than the development of strong social capital if communities are to move forward toward their ideals. Indeed, strong social capital is highly correlated with the presence of virtually every indicator of a strong and healthy community (e.g., low crime, high school retention and test scores, low bullying behaviors, high trust levels, high voter turnout, strong nonprofit organizations, and high community volunteerism (Putnam 2001). Consequently, as the strategic actions are implemented, there needs to be intentional focus on building strong interconnections and relationships among people, associations, and organizations as the plan advances. Without this focus, actions that are implemented will not be sustainable.

Evaluation. This element implies that there is clear articulation of the specific outputs, outcomes, and impacts of each strategic action that is implemented in the community. And, it implies that there is constant monitoring of whether these outputs, outcomes, and impacts are – in fact – occurring as action unfolds. Moreover, it implies that there is constant assessment that the actions being undertaken are inclusive of the broad ranging interests of the community as a whole. It implies that there is continual tracking of the kinds and effectiveness of interconnections being made between individuals, associations, and organizations within the community (i.e., social capital). Sound evaluation includes both process evaluation (whether things are being done correctly to achieve desired outcomes) and product evaluation (what outcomes actually were accomplished, and how these may or may not fit with community ideals). It is also continuous, and provides feedback to the community about whether adjustments need to be made in the action plans over time, and even whether the community vision needs to be reformulated or adjusted as specific accomplishments unfold. As Figure 1 indicates, there is a direct feed from the evaluation process into the Strategic Community Engagement process, which implies that the results of evaluation directly frame (a) what is strategically needed to mobilize all assets within the community, and (b) to ensure community actions are maximally aligned with the community vision.

As FireStar investments unfold in Central City South, each of these six components of the ABCD community development process must be activated, and must all interact to ensure effectiveness of the investment. Every action taken must be anchored in a community visioning process. Every community visioning process must be anchored in broad scale resident engagement. Action plans must focus on building, mobilizing and connecting existing assets with the community. Internal assets must be organized first, before connections to the resources of the external community are made. Community investments become effective only when the community itself defines the destiny, and its own people and organizations become the assets for creating that destiny.

Predictors of Success in Neighborhood Building Efforts

The community development literature has an abundance of research on – and case studies of -- neighborhoods that have been revitalized through community building efforts. In fact, in 2004, the Amherst Wilder Foundation identified 525 evaluation studies of community-based neighborhood redevelopment projects in the United States (Mattessich, Monsey, & Roy, 2004). Since then, hundreds of additional studies have been added to the mix (Phillips and Pittman 2009). The Amherst Wilder Foundation conducted a mega-analysis of the 525 studies identified in its report (Mattessich, Monsey, & Roy, 2004). Its analysis identified twenty-eight (28) specific factors that separated successful community building efforts from non-successful ones. These twenty-eight factors can be summarized into six core themes. From a general perspective, research informs us that successful neighborhood building efforts transpire if and only if the following six conditions are woven throughout the process:
• The neighborhood has motivation from within the community, with identifiable within-community leadership and broad scale awareness of issues that community members deem important.

• There is widespread participation of all community residents, networks of associations, and organizations in the neighborhood building activities.

• There is a good record of fact-finding, including systematic gathering of information on aspirations, challenges, opportunities, and analysis of issues.

• Neighborhood building activities are built with an eye on both process and product. There is a focus on building relationships within the neighborhood, and developing self-generating, sustainable and community-driven solutions to neighborhood issues.

• People or institutions from outside the neighborhood who wish to be helpful to the neighborhood must be perceived by residents and community organizations as being willing:
  o to be authentically committed to the neighborhood’s well being
  o to stay in partnership with the neighborhood work over the long haul, regardless of short term successes or failures
  o to support mechanisms for having the residents and community organizations drive the process of neighborhood development
  o to be willing to develop and encourage trust relationships with neighborhood residents, associations and institutions.

• People who wish to help the neighborhood (both internal leaders and external providers/facilitators) must be listeners, with an open mind and heart to the neighborhood, and the capacity to be flexible and adaptable to constantly changing situations.

In sum, from a national perspective, the literature informs us that if FireStar investments are to be successful, these six essentials must be woven into the decision-making process. Collectively, they suggest that the solutions for any kind of community challenge rest within the community itself. And, they suggest that the pathways for reaching whatever vision the community has established for itself can only be defined by the community itself. All of these essentials echo the very foundation of the Asset Based Community Development model.

**Other Guidelines for Successful Investments**

Reported above are basic tenets of successful community investing as defined by the community building literature. In addition to these essentials, we recommend five additional investment guidelines that should guide FireStar investment decision-making in Central City South. These guidelines are based in the many experiences PCD staff have had in community development initiatives across the state of Arizona.

These five guidelines are:

• **FireStar investments should perpetuate and enhance the vision of the Central City South community.** The vision must be defined by community members (residents, community-based organizations, and local businesses). That vision was most recently expressed in the community’s Quality of Life Plan (*Central City South, Phoenix Arizona: Our Community, Our
Vision, Our Quality of Life Plan, Phoenix Revitalization Corporation). Thus, strategic investments should center on achieving the vision expressed in that plan. The investments should make Central City South a better place to live, work, play, and raise families.

- **FireStar investments should recognize the community’s diversity.** A healthy investment strategy, designed to build a strong and vibrant community, simultaneously considers the needs of all community members. It discovers a way to build strength among all sectors and populations by developing support systems targeted toward the enhancement of each one.

- **FireStar investments should focus on the development of self-sustaining community development processes.** The goal of investments should focus on growing the problem-solving capacity of the community, rather than doing things for the community. This involves developing self-generating processes within the community that grow leadership to carry programs forward into the future on a self-sustaining basis, rather than on funding programs that terminate once the funding ends.

- **FireStar investments should focus on leveraging existing resources and creating new forms of self-sustaining revenue streams.** Investor resources should be utilized to build capacity or add capacity to existing investments, as well as to attract other revenue streams to the community. They should be targeted toward creating the kind of successes that will draw new forms of leveraged resources from foundations, business, and federal, state, and local sources.

- **FireStar investments must be accompanied by outcomes evaluation using clear performance measures.** The desired outcomes of investment should be articulated in measurable terms. These specified outcomes should be developed for each investment to document the kinds of impacts each project has created in moving the community toward an ideal. Additionally, project funding must be accompanied by formal mechanisms for process and outcome evaluation to ensure optimization of return on investment.

In sum, FireStar investments in Central City South should focus on responding to the established vision of the community, be responsive to the community’s diversity, be sustainable, add capacity through leveraging existing success stories, and be accompanied by strong processes of evaluation. This framework creates a pathway for success, both in the near term, and over a long perspective. Sustainability, relevance, and desired outcomes defined by the community must be the hallmark of these investments.

**Key Community Organizations**

There are many community assets within the assessment’s boundaries. Among the assets are two community-based organizations that will anchor the focus of the assessment, and therefore are highlighted here.

The first is **Friendly House**, a 501-c3 nonprofit organization that will serve as the operational and fiduciary partner for FireStar in the Central City South community. The second is the **Phoenix Revitalization Corporation (PRC)**, a non-profit community development corporation serving Central City.
South. PRC recently facilitated a community-driven Quality of Life plan that is integral to the formation of this assessment.

**Friendly House.** Friendly House will serve as the Collaborative Partner for FireStar in Central City South. Friendly House has been a partner agency of VSUW since 1940, and has a long legacy of serving the Central City South community for over 90 years. The main offices of Friendly House, as well as those of its three auxiliary units (Friendly House Youth Services, Friendly House Academia Del Pueblo Charter School, and Friendly House Immigration Services) are all located within the Central City South community. Its myriad of community-based services and programs are organized around seven functional areas: adult education, workforce development, family services/counseling, home care, immigration services, Academia Del Pueblo charter school, and youth services. The Friendly House vision is “To be the recognized established leader in the provision of high quality services to assist families in realizing their dreams”. Its mission is “Promoting success and independence by serving the educational and human service needs of Arizona families”. Annually, Friendly House serves 40,000 families, youth and children for the purpose of “building success and independence for a better America”. More information about Friendly House is offered in Appendix B.

**Phoenix Revitalization Corporation.** Phoenix Revitalization Corporation has been serving the Central City South Community since 1986, when it was created as a project of Phoenix Memorial Hospital to address the historic blight of the neighborhoods surrounding the hospital. Since then, it has expanded its focus to other Phoenix neighborhoods, but it maintains a primary emphasis on the revitalization of an area geographically defined by Grant Street on the north, Central Avenue on the East, and the Maricopa Freeway (I-17) on the south and west.

PRC focuses on community improvement projects, neighborhood leadership development, and the maintenance and creation of low-income and workforce housing. The PRC vision is “For people to live in healthy, safe, culturally vibrant and thriving communities”. Its mission is “To revitalize communities through affordable housing and community development”. Pertaining to this assessment, PRC has played a key role in facilitating a process for community residents and stakeholders to create a vision for Central City South, and a plan for strategic action to enhance its quality of life (PRC, 2010). More information about PRC is offered in Appendix B.

Beyond these two community-based organizations, it is also worthy to make note of a recently formed funders collaborative that has developed a focus on Central City South as well as other Phoenix communities. Known as the Phoenix Neighborhood Development Collaborative (PNDC), it was created in 2008 to form collaboration between private foundations, local corporations, and government agencies who share a common purpose of improving economic and social conditions in low income neighborhoods of Phoenix. Direct investors in the PNDC are: Arizona Community Foundation, JP Morgan Chase Bank, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), St. Luke’s Health Initiative, The Lodestar Foundation, and VSUW. Another collaborator includes the City of Phoenix. LISC acts as lead community agency for PNDC. These partners are working collectively to coordinate their investment strategies in Central City South (as well as in other Phoenix neighborhoods) so that the collective impact of their activities will be maximized. For example, PNDC orchestrated funding for the community’s Quality of Life Plan.
Assessment of the Central City South Community

The assessment methodologies utilized for this assessment were constructed under the asset-based community development model. At its core, the purpose of the assessment is to generate a roadmap for guiding FireStar investments in the Central City South community. The platform for creating this roadmap was generated by seven specific methodologies that are commonly associated with asset-based community development. They are:

1. **Community Vital Signs Assessment.** At the core of every community assessment, is an analysis of available data on socio-demographic and economic indicators that define the community, its residents and its organizations. Examples of such data include: household composition, income indicators, health and public safety indicators, and other economic and life quality indicators. This methodology calls for assembling what is known about variables that have bearing on the vitality of the community. The themes that emerged from this methodology are summarized beginning on page 20 of this assessment, and reviewed in detail within Appendix A.

2. **Review of Past Studies in Central City South.** The Central Phoenix South community has been included in assessment and planning efforts in the past, and analyzed as part of broader community assessments. Each of these past efforts provides a partial glimpse into the goals, hopes and challenges of residents and organizations within the study area. This methodology provides an assessment of significant insights offered by these studies. The themes that emerged are reviewed beginning on page 22 of this assessment.

3. **Community Conversations.** A typical feature of most asset-based community assessments is to create a variety of opportunities for extensive conversation with the residents and organizations comprising the fabric of the community. These coalesce the voices of a diversity of residents and organizations, and take place in many forms, including one-on-one conversations, focus groups, town halls, neighborhood meetings, and surveys. In the case of the Central City South community, a robust process of such community conversations was recently completed under the leadership of the Phoenix Revitalization Corporation (PRC, 2010). At the request of community stakeholders, the themes emerging from that process largely define the input for the Community Conversations methodology in this assessment. The themes are introduced beginning on page 25 of this report, and are detailed in Appendix D.

4. **Key Informant Research.** In-depth personal interviews were conducted with strategically chosen community members, or those with unique knowledge of Central City South community needs, aspirations, challenges, services, and programs. A total of seventeen key informant interviews were conducted, strategically selected to represent different sectors serving the community: government, non-profit, faith-based, community volunteer groups, funders, and business. These individuals were asked, through roughly 90-minute interviews, specific questions about neighborhood visions, challenges, points of pride, assets, existing programs, and services, as well as avenues for productive community investments from an asset-based planning perspective. The themes that emerged from these conversations are detailed beginning on page 29 of this report. Appendix C has a list of those interviewed.

5. **Community Asset Mapping.** The asset-based community development framework calls for concept of building community investments upon successful, existing community assets, including facilities, institutions, programs, and services. This assessment includes the results of an analysis of these assets within the Central City South community. A comprehensive
inventory of these assets is contained in Appendix B. A summary of programs identified by key informants as potential arenas for FireStar investment is provided beginning on page 36 of this assessment.

6. **Review of National Literature and Best Practices.** This assessment is anchored in nationally-recognized “best practices” for community development. One of the key methodologies was to ensure (a) core insights of asset-based community development methodology were reflected in the preparation of this report, (b) nationally accepted approaches to assessment were followed, and (c) core insights about effective action plan development and asset-based intervention strategies were considered. In addition to the “best practices” that has already been posited as the conceptual frame for this assessment, a review of the national literature and “best practices” that has particular bearing on building a road map for FireStar investments is provided beginning on pages 37 of this assessment.

7. **Action Planning and Priority-Setting Process.** The above six methodologies served as the foundation for an action planning process with the Neighborhood Advocacy Team. After primary insights from methodologies 1 through 6 were presented to the Committee, the PCD facilitated a visioning process to guide the Neighborhood Advocacy Team through a process that established priorities for fund distribution. The results of that process framed the conclusion of this assessment, and set the structure for the two-year action plan for the Central City South project. The descriptions of the process, as well as the results are reviewed beginning on page 46 of this assessment.

**Primary Insights**

Core findings emerging from each of the project’s seven methodologies are presented below in executive summary format. When appropriate, the reader is directed to Appendices, which offer additional detail.

**Methodology 1: Community Vital Signs Assessment**

A comprehensive review of the socio-demographic and economic vital signs for the Central City South community is offered in Appendix A of this assessment. A summary sketch of those details is offered here.

From a historical perspective, it is important to note that neighborhoods within the community are among the oldest in the city of Phoenix. Nearly three-quarters of the housing units were constructed prior to 1970 and over one-third were constructed prior to 1950. It is also important to note that these neighborhoods hold some of the greatest economic challenges in the city. The number of housing units requiring repair are among the highest in the city -- ranging from 40-50% in some neighborhoods to 80-100% in others. In the last census (2000), the average household income for the community was $21,471, significantly less that the average household income of $49,923 for the entirety of the city. Over sixty percent of the residents live in poverty, and about nine out of ten families living in poverty have children under the age of 18. During the 2000 census, the unemployment rate for the community was nineteen percent.

In 2000, the largest ethnic group in the community was Hispanic, comprising approximately seventy-five percent of the population. Non-Hispanic Blacks represented about sixteen percent of the population,
and Non-Hispanic Whites comprised about four percent of the population. Just over one percent of the population categorized themselves as American Indians/Alaska Natives, and about the same percentage self-identified themselves as Asians. The population was almost evenly distributed among males and females. Nearly one-third of the residents were less than sixteen, and about twenty-two percent were between the ages of five and fifteen. Almost ten percent were over 64 years of age. The median age is 23.8.

The majority of households in the community are households with two or more individuals. Family households constitute the largest segment of households – representing two-thirds of the households (about the same percentage as for that of the city as a whole). At the same time, the number of single-person households is high (approximately thirty percent) relative to the city-wide norm (nine percent). The average household size is 3.12 and the average number of individuals in family households is 4.46.

The frequency of reported disabilities is relatively high in this community. Nearly one-third reported some form of disability for the 2000 census.

The most frequently reported employment sectors for males were: construction, arts, entertainment, accommodations and food services, and manufacturing. The most frequently reported employment sectors for females were: educational, health, and human services. Within the community itself, there are 186 employers with three or more employees – representing a diverse range of sectors but showing particular concentration in manufacturing, health care and social service organizations, and wholesale trade businesses.

The level of educational attainment for community residents is among the lowest in the city. In the 2000 census, about 70 percent of the residents aged 25 and higher reported that they had not graduated from high school – compared to a city-wide average of about 31 percent. There are five elementary/intermediate schools located geographically within the community – two public schools and two charter schools. State achievement test scores for the most part run lower than other schools on a state-wide basis. Three of these five schools did not achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, signifying they did not achieve the minimum levels of improvement determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures. For high school grade levels, the community is primarily served by Central High School and North High School, both located north of downtown Phoenix. In general, the schools have been rated as “Performing” schools by state standards.

Crime rates for the community generally followed the downward trends for the city as a whole for the three-year period beginning in 2006. Exceptions were for reports of sexual assault and theft. At the same time, per capita statistics reveal a crime rate that is above average for the city as a whole. In general, the per capita crime rate is in excess of twenty percent higher than for the city as a whole. During the three year period of 2006-2008, homicide rates ranged from double to four times that of the city as a whole on an annual basis. Robbery, aggravated assault, sexual assault, overall violent crime, and property crime generally runs about double that of the city-wide average.

The community has relatively good access to public transportation, but experiences sub-optimal conditions along certain dimensions of urban infrastructure and environment. Some of the water and sewer infrastructure, while currently serving needs of the residents, is old and does not meet city standards. Some neighborhoods do not have sidewalks, yet progress is being made to create them. Many alleys in the neighborhood are chip-sealed, but are unpaved. Properties contaminated by industrial operations are scattered throughout the community. The area is impacted by jet noise from
overflights associated with Sky Harbor International Airport, and fumes and traffic noise from the elevated I-17 freeway corridor to the south and west of the community.

The majority of the community has multi-family residential zoning (R-3, R-4, and R-5), but there are also large blocks of Commercial (C-1, C-2, C-3) and Industrial (A-1, A-2) as well. Parts of the community are in two City of Phoenix Overlay Districts, specifically, Central City South Overlay District, and East Buckeye Road Overlay District. These are designed to promote land uses that protect and enhance the revitalization and quality of growth of the community.

**Methodology 2: Review of Past Studies in Central Phoenix**

Over the past decade, several studies have highlighted the assets, challenges, and aspirations of residents and organizations within the Central City South community, or in communities that overlap with the geographical boundaries of the Central City South community. Eight of these studies are particularly germane to the goal of this assessment. Specific findings that provide important illumination of the character, voices and aspirations of the community are highlighted here. The eight studies are:

- The Central City South Charrette (Joint Urban Design Program 2000)
- Central City South Housing Study and Community Revitalization Plan (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2000a)
- Phoenix Central City South Action Strategy (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2000b)
- Strategic Plan for Community and Economic Development (Arizona Public Service 2003)
- Central City South Area Plan (City of Phoenix 2004)
- Central City South Communities for All Ages (Arizona Community Foundation 2007)
- Central City South at a Glance (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2009)
- Central City South -- Phoenix Arizona: Our Community, Our Vision, Our Quality of Life Plan (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2010)

Before we review the predominate themes emerging from these studies, it is also important to note that Central City South (predominately west of Central Avenue) was the focal point for at least six additional studies in the seventies, eighties and nineties. Since themes emerging from those studies parallel those of more recent studies, only the more recent studies are reviewed here. For details on earlier studies, the reader is invited to examine the document “Reinventing Neighborhoods: the Central City South Charrette” published by Arizona State University’s Joint Urban Design Program (2000).

**The Central City South Charrette - 2000**

Over a four-day period in 1999, the Joint Urban Design Program of Arizona State University conducted a series of resident-driven tours, workshops and design charrettes with Central City South residents and other community stakeholders. The report (Joint Urban Design Program 2000) provides a comprehensive community assessment of the Central City South area west of Central – including a detailed historical analysis, an assessment of assets, exploration of community challenges, and a roadmap for helping the community achieve its vision as expressed through the four-day process. The report synthesized the expressed concerns of community members into ten categories: *homelessness, traffic, air pollution, crime, lighting, airplane noise, alley closures, blight, need for a grocery store, and absence of sidewalks*. It also offered twelve recommendations for change in the community: organize
the community around a 15- to 20-year strategy, preserve and enhance community assets, retain businesses and employers, create a plaza for commerce and activity, establish an infill and revitalization strategy, create new mixed density housing, utilize rail lines to create new business parks, increase number of bus stops, create mixed entertainment/residential/office district, connect to Rio Salado redevelopment area, develop comprehensive community information program, utilize transportation gateways to develop new employment centers.

Central City South Housing Study and Community Revitalization Plan - 2000

This study of housing and community revitalization needs in Central City South was executed by the Phoenix Revitalization Corporation (2000a). It concluded that three major factors stood as obstacles to reinvestment in the area: noise impacts from Sky Harbor International Airport, the concentration of environmentally hazardous facilities, and high crime rates. The housing study found 62% of the residential lots were either vacant or had homes in critical condition, an additional 24% in need of moderate to major repairs, and an additional 14% in need of minor repair. The plan called for establishment of a Neighborhood Initiative Area (NIA) designation, or some other form of redevelopment jurisdiction, to create a focused redevelopment program. It recommended a process of continued community participation, creation of a task force to address community issues (see below), and the preparation of a housing development strategy.

Phoenix Central City South Action Strategy - 2000

This strategic action planning process was spearheaded by the Phoenix Revitalization Corporation (2000b). A Central City South Task Force was assembled to create a public participation process to identify community issues and make recommendations for their resolution. The Task Force was seeking Neighborhood Initiative Area (NIA) or other form of redevelopment district and ultimately led to the creation of the Central City South Overlay District. In addition to documenting the need for an integrated land use plan, community residents and stakeholders identified five major challenges or needs in the area: public safety (including crime, homelessness, and traffic safety issues), lack of community services, the need for economic development, adult education, and workforce development.

Strategic Plan for Community and Economic Development - 2003

The development of this strategic plan was sponsored by Arizona Public Service and was a component of its Focused Future Program. It featured an extensive public involvement process with a focus on developing strategic actions to improve the economy of Central City South. The community developed a three-pronged statement of vision: strengthening its neighborhoods, developing neighborhood services and facilities, and creating quality jobs (Arizona Public Service 2003). To accomplish this, four specific needs were identified: quality housing, neighborhood safety, neighborhood beautification, and community/economic development.
Central City South Area Plan - 2004

The Central City South Area Plan stands as one of the most comprehensive strategic plans in the history of the community. It was created by the Planning Department of the City of Phoenix, and focused on the Central City South area west of Central Avenue, south of Grant Street and bounded on the west and south by the I-10 freeway (City of Phoenix 2004). It contains a review of the community’s history, existing land use, land use designations, existing community conditions (needs, challenges, and assets), and a statement of community vision. The planning process included numerous community meetings, and nine community identified issues emerged: land use, housing, neighborhood preservation, circulation, economic development, job training and child care, environment, socio-economic issues, and public safety. These themes will be analyzed in further detail in the Methodology 3: Community Conversations section of the report below. The planning process culminated in the development of a four-point plan to help the community achieve its vision: (1) obtain quality housing in attractive, well-served neighborhoods, (2) create a safe environment in which to live and work, (3) create economic opportunities for area residences and businesses, and (4) transition heavy industrial uses to more compatible land uses. A series of supporting objectives and related recommendations for each goal are offered in the plan.

Central City South Communities for All Ages - 2005

Central City South was a host community for Arizona Community Foundation’s Community for All Ages program beginning in 2005. The purpose of the program was to incubate innovative inter-generational programs that improve the quality of life for Central City South residents (west of Central). As one component of the environmental assessment for the program, focus groups were held with three generations of residents: seniors (aged 65 and older), adults (aged 19 through 64), and youth (18 and younger). Each population was asked to identify major challenges within, and aspirations for Central City South. Seniors focused on infrastructure issues such as lack of retail, pharmacy, food establishments, medical services, and transportation, plus safety, adult education, children’s education, recreation, and access to human services. Adults focused on increased homelessness, heavy (18-wheeler) truck volume, air pollution, drugs, crime, inadequate street lighting, airplane noise and pollution, crime-infested alleyways, neighborhood blight, lack of large grocery, and lack of sidewalks. Youth focused on the need for quality and affordable housing, volunteering, educational opportunities, programs to bring the community and generations together, community celebrations, better transportation, access to decision-makers, leadership development, and community information. Five summary issues were identified that seemed to be pervasive throughout the community and across all populations: crime, blight, lack of amenities, lack of adequate recreational facilities and opportunities, and a high level of transient people. The project also completed an asset map and a demographic analysis. Ultimately, the project created a multi-generational leadership academy, which has offered over 15 classes training over 150 residents to date, ranging in age from 12-72. It has also created several inter-generational arts, culture, recreation and entertainment programs, a Community Action Team (CAT) which has representation from thirteen neighborhoods, and a quarterly newsletter for Central City South residents. Further information is available from the Phoenix Revitalization Corporation (2007).

Central City South at a Glance - 2009

The Phoenix Revitalization Corporation released a comprehensive inventory of assets focused on land-use and existing conditions in 2009. Its report, Central City South at a Glance, highlights land use
and assets for each of eight specific neighborhoods west of Central Avenue (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2009). It provides geographic mapping of commercial and residential land use, vacant parcels, and assets such as restaurants, faith communities, schools, parks, historic sites, and service providers. Summary tables at the end of the report give comprehensive listings for each of these assets, broken down by each of the eight neighborhoods. As such, the documentation within that report offers a useful compendium to the asset mapping conducted for this assessment (Appendix B) for the four neighborhoods west of Central Avenue. The four neighborhoods are: Matthew Henson, Grant Park, 7-11, and Marcos de Niza.

Central City South -- Phoenix Arizona: Our Community, Our Vision, Our Quality of Life Plan - 2010

The most recent study of the Central City South community is a Quality of Life Plan (QLP) developed by residents and other community stakeholders within Central City South neighborhoods west of Central Avenue. The study led 62 residents and 31 stakeholders through a process of learning about revitalization best practices, current community assets and initiatives, and building strategies that led them forward to develop their community ideal (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2010). The QLP positions itself as a “document to be used collectively by residents and stakeholders to work towards creating neighborhoods that are healthy, safe, economically vibrant, and happy places for families to live, work, and play.” (p.6) It further defines itself as a “road map that can inform residents and stakeholders as to what direction (quality of life results) they are headed, the best ways (strategies) to move in that direction, and how they will know when they are successful (indicators and performance measures).” (p. 6). The QLP frames out eight specific domains around which to build the community’s desired future: recreation, health, community services, individual development, housing, economic development, transportation and “golden threads” (defined as pride, community safety, and beautification). In the report, these domains are accompanied by a series of specific sub-strategies (ranging from 4 to 17 sub-strategies for each). Each sub-strategy, in turn, has a specified time frame, an identified set of lead organizations, and a list of committed or potential partners. As noted earlier in the report, the themes emerging from the QLP process largely define the input for the Community Conversations methodology reported below.

Methodology 3: Community Conversations

Throughout the past decade, a number of community based efforts have been undertaken with the hope of promoting the revitalization of the Central City South area. All of these have involved some form of community conversations on the hopes, aspirations, and challenges experienced by neighborhood residents. The results are summarized in the above section of this report.

At the request of community stakeholders, the PCD did not create a new wave of community conversations, focus groups, community-based meeting participation, and/or town hall methodologies that are characteristic of its assessment activities. The request was well advised, as many perceive that the community has been sufficiently assessed for purposes related to the goal of this assessment. Moreover, a very robust process of community visioning for Central City South was just being completed during the period this assessment was being completed (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2010).

Therefore, assessment results for the Community Conversations methodology will be restricted to relaying results from two primary documents: The Central City South Area Plan (City of Phoenix 2004) and the recently released Central City South Quality of Life Plan (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation
2010). The former offers a synthesis of the numerous forms of community visioning processes that were completed prior to 2004. And the latter represents the most recent, and comprehensive, form of community visioning publicly available today.

Even while so doing, it must be noted that there are inherent limitations to this approach. The majority of past studies – including the Quality of Life Plan – have focused on geographic areas not strictly aligned with this assessment’s community boundaries. For example, this assessment defines the Central City South community as resting between 15th Avenue and 7th Street. Most past studies have not included neighborhoods east of Central, and include neighborhoods well west of 15th Avenue.

The review that follows is intended to faithfully convey core insights from the two reports (Central Area South Area Plan, Quality of Life Plan) without duplicating their contents in full. Readers are encouraged to turn to these reports for richer detail.

The Central City South Area Plan synthesized the results of all community visioning studies conducted prior to 1994. It identified nine core themes that were raised repeatedly across these studies as issues of concern to Central City South residents: land use, housing, neighborhood preservation, circulation, economic development, job training and day care, environment, socio-economic issues, and public safety. A summary table of the results of the Plan’s synthesis of past studies was provided in the report (City of Phoenix 2004, p. 19), and is reproduced here (Table 2). These results offer a vital perspective for the desired outcome of Methodology 3 of this assessment – to capture expressions of the hopes, aspirations, and challenges of Central City South residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Land Use</th>
<th>6. Job Training and Day Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Heavy industrial open land uses</td>
<td>• Improved access to educational and training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blight</td>
<td>• Lack of supportive services such as day care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Housing</td>
<td>7. Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Illegal dumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient home ownership</td>
<td>• Too many industries dealing in hazardous waste and polluting activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor quality housing</td>
<td>• Air and noise impacts from airport and freeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited range of products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neighborhood Preservation</td>
<td>8. Socio-Economic Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Junk in vacant lots</td>
<td>• Potential gentrification and displacement of residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inconsistent code enforcement</td>
<td>• Drug Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to retain neighborhood historic and cultural identity</td>
<td>• Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of sidewalks</td>
<td>• Need to improve relationships between residents &amp; police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speeding traffic</td>
<td>• Improve visibility of police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Truck traffic through neighborhood</td>
<td>• Insufficient street lighting in some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trash in alleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to better jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hiring by local businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for major grocery store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of neighborhood retail services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Core Community-Defined Issues in Central City South – 2004 *

* Table 2 represents core themes emerging from Central City South community-based studies prior to 2004. This synthesis was prepared by the City of Phoenix Planning Department and reproduces information in Figure 19 of its Central City South Area Plan (City of Phoenix 2004).

Importantly, the Central City South Area Plan also provided a community-defined statement of vision for the community (City of Phoenix 2004, p. 20). The statement of vision was derived from past community studies, as well as from a community-based process that accompanied development of the Plan. The Plan describes the vision statement as something that “brings to focus community aspirations for the future … a reference point against which all actions should be evaluated.”

The vision statement described by the Plan is:

“Central City South is a safe, desirable place to live and work; it is a vibrant community of diverse, identifiable neighborhoods where residents are proud of their rich community history and cultural heritage. New quality housing in a range of prices has replaced vacant lots and
blighted properties, while some historic structures have been restored. Residential areas are screened from unattractive industrial uses and from heavy traffic.

Central City South attracts people of many income levels who wish to live close to employment, entertainment and culture in downtown Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport, the Rio Salado Project, and the Capital Mall. Businesses locate here to take advantage of the pool of trained workers, as well as the area’s excellent access to markets. Shopping areas are well designed, and services are conveniently located. Pathways provide safe, attractive connections between housing, schools, parks and shopping, and link the community to Downtown, the Capital Mall and the Rio Salado amenities.”

While not all elements of the vision statement lie within the scope of the FireStar investments, a clear context is provided as decisions are made about the character of those investments. That process is summarized in the section Methodology 7: Action Planning and Priority-Setting Process, found on page 46 of this assessment.

**Phoenix Revitalization Corporation Resident Strategies**

The second study that provides a clear context for FireStar investments is the recently completed Central City South Quality of Life Plan (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2010). As described earlier, the resident- and stakeholder-driven process identified eight broad strategies, and many specific sub-strategies, around which to build the community’s future. They stand as arguably the most recent, and comprehensive, statements of the community’s hopes, aspirations and challenges. Each of the broad strategies is listed below, accompanied by a summary statement of explanatory material in the Quality of Life Plan that defines the essence of the strategy. Sections of the Quality of Life Plan that are pertinent to each strategy are identified by page numbers.

**Strategy 1 - Recreation**

The *Recreation* strategy focuses on developing intergenerational and multi-cultural programs that celebrate the stories of the community, as well as introduce the community to new experiences. Moreover, community members feel that the positive use of leisure time can create healthier and happier residents. (QLP, pp. 15-18)

**Strategy 2 – Health**

The *Health* strategy is based on the desire to increase awareness of healthy living through education. It also identifies the need for new facilities and services to support healthy living initiatives. (QLP, pp. 19-21)

**Strategy 3 – Services**

The *Services* strategy defines a need to promote stronger relationships between service providers and the community. It also calls for the development of additional human service programs currently not available in the community, and the development of communication tools to inform the community about services that are available. (QLP, pp. 22-24)
Strategy 4 – Individual Development

The *Individual Development* strategy is designed for the dual purpose of reducing unemployment and increasing family household income. It calls for the development of opportunities around employment, education and training programs. (QLP, pp. 25-30)

Strategy 5 – Housing

The *Housing* strategy reflects the desire to improve the condition of existing homes, and to construct new housing on properties currently vacant. Moreover, the strategy calls for all homes to be occupied. (QLP, pp. 25-33)

Strategy 6 – Economic Development

The *Economic Development* strategy calls for the development of new services, resources, retail and employment opportunities. The residents expressed a vision that all the amenities and opportunities typically found in newer neighborhoods be offered within Central City South. (QLP, pp. 34-40)

Strategy 7 – Transportation

The *Transportation* strategy expresses the desire for maintaining and upgrading transportation routes and support facilities such as bus stops, street lights, and streets. (QLP, pp. 41-44)

Strategy 8 - Golden Threads

The *Golden Threads* strategy captures resident interests in enhancing community pride, community safety, and beautification. The residents feel that “neighbor to neighbor” acts of helping each other would create community health, vitality, and happiness. (QLP, pp. 45-49)

The many sub-strategies surrounding each of these eight core strategies are summarized in Appendix D. The sub-strategies, coupled with the summary of past research provided in Table 2, provide an important source of insight on community voices and how they might shape the character of FireStar investments. The process for doing so will be described in the *Methodology 7 - Action Planning and Priority-Setting Process* section of this assessment (see p. 46).

Methodology 4: Key Informant Research

In-depth personal interviews were conducted with representatives of sixteen organizations (governmental, funders, service providers, non-profits and researchers) that either work directly within the Central City South community or with neighborhoods facing similar challenges. The key informants interviewed are listed in Appendix C.

During the course of the interviews, which averaged approximately 90 minutes each, the informants generally were asked about how their organizations were currently serving the community, and about their perceptions on neighborhood visioning processes, challenges, assets, existing programs and services, and avenues for productive community investments from an asset-based planning perspective.
The sections that follow summarize the essence of those conversations, organized around the three major goals of the key informant research:

- **Suggestions for Investment** – What are the most important messages that need to be heard by those who want to make Central City South a better place? What are some principles or values that should guide effective community investment? How might Fund resources best leverage existing community development efforts in Central City South?
- **Community Challenges** – What are the core challenges of the community that might have bearing on establishing priorities for FireStar investments?
- **Firefighter Roles** – How might firefighters contribute to community development efforts beyond their traditional emergency response and life-saving roles?

Interviewers recorded detailed notes of the conversations, which were combined for the purpose of extracting prevailing themes across the interviews. The results are summarized below.

**Suggestions for Investment – Key Informants**

As the key informants focused on the general question of what guidelines, processes or outcomes might be important to consider as FireStar investment decisions are being made, nine general themes emerged. These nine themes, reported below, essentially capture the richness and scope of the comments made.

**Theme 1: Develop a Positive, Hopeful, and Asset-Based Outlook among Residents and Service Providers**

There was consensus among the key informants that investments should be done in a way that engenders a more hopeful, positive disposition among some of the residents and service providers alike. This would provide the necessary platform to catalyze community development practices that are built on the asset-based model and engage skills, perspectives and ideas from the entirety of the community.

Concerns were expressed by informants that some members of the community have developed a mindset of dependency. There was a sense that, in many ways, a culture has been pervasive within the community that prompts it to look to the “outside” for assistance to address its challenges. Moreover, there was a sense that residents have historically not been strongly involved in creating their own solutions to community needs. Thus, they have been uninspired to be a part of the needed change – leading to a recursive cycle of entitlement and erosion of empowerment that has become the norm. One informant felt that the community has numerous services available but did not feel that they were being utilized by the residents because of this mindset. Concerns were also expressed about the youth of the community, and the prevailing tendency of many to not accept responsibility or accountability in the affairs of the community. Discussions centered on the forces attracting them toward pop culture, materialism and fame rather than serving their community. Even efforts to empower and educate the youth, if designed inappropriately, can be counter-productive toward building sustainable engagement in the community. Concern was expressed that too many service provider efforts on these fronts result in youth migration out of the community, rather than focusing on processes that simultaneously empower the youth and stabilize the community.
Theme 2: Build Community Cohesion and Identity

A frequently expressed concern was that the community has been chronically “overly assessed” by researchers and service providers alike in a way that leads only to short term solutions that do not engage residents is problem-solving and community life quality development. It was noted that such efforts not only result in unsustainable processes, but create dependency and lack of a collective community efficacy. There is a perception that there simply is not the community connectivity in Central City South that one might find in other areas with similar challenges. Such communities have been able to draw upon such social interconnectivity in ways that mobilize community assets to solve challenges. This connectivity must be developed in Central City South to effect lasting change. It was suggested that strategic processes to build community cohesion, identity, and a sense of pride in the community would create the necessary foundation for collective visioning and problem-solving. One informant noted that there are fewer incidences of graffiti in the HOPE VI area, which can likely be attributed to the sense of pride and identity in that particular neighborhood. There was the sense that such processes can be amplified throughout all of Central City South to create the kind of community attachment and pride that will inspire the same kind of pride and engagement experienced in HOPE VI.

Theme 3: Cross-Cultural Understanding, Collaboration, and Celebration

Many informants pointed to the partitioning of cultures and race within the Central City South neighborhoods as a challenge to effective community building. The sense was that tensions and tendencies toward separation have eased over the years, but that community development practices must be intentionally designed to inspire residents of many backgrounds and interests to join together in community building processes. Cross-cultural leadership development programs, community events, educational programs, and recreation and socialization opportunities were suggested as important venues. Also suggested was the importance of creating environments for peer-to-peer conversations, and use of community newsletters as mechanisms for building cross-cultural understanding, collaboration, and celebration.

Theme 4: Focus on Process as Much as Outcome

A message was strongly expressed that if investments are to lead to enduring change, a focus on the process of community engagement is far more important than the process of delivering specified end products. In other words, the informants felt that the character of how community development programs are structured is as important as what these programs are designed to accomplish. Any funder making investments in Central City South must be patient as progress historically has been slow. The informants focused on the need for providers to develop trustworthy relations with residents, and to follow through on commitments made. Informants pointed to the absolute essentiality of engaging in authentic dialogue with community residents and organizations. They also pointed to the need to strive for relatively quick “small successes,” and the need to celebrate these successes continually and strategically as inspirational testimonies of real changes in individuals, organizations, and the community as a whole. If the expectations of development are kept simple and incremental, smaller successes will build to sustainable and large-scale change through increasing community engagement and asset mobilization.
Theme 5: Focus on Engaging Residents in Sustainable Solutions

Informants were emphatic that any form of investment in Central City South must engage residents in creating sustainable solutions to the aspirations and challenges that they themselves articulate. Assets need to be mobilized, and they can only be mobilized through community engagement. The essentiality of a resident-driven process was highlighted across virtually all interviews, and tended to be the topic of conversation at many points within individual interviews. It is critical that any form of investment catalyze residents to view themselves as having gifts and capacities that can feed desired change. Residents must be involved in all processes and be an essential component of any program design and implementation over time. An abundance of resident forums to create opportunities for engagement and celebration would serve the investment process well.

Theme 6: Follow Progression from Individual to Collective Engagement

With residents engaged, there must be a process for collective action. The informants emphasized that investments must create systems or mechanisms for assembling the gifts and capacities of individuals into larger processes or initiatives for change. On the one hand, individual residents must be equipped with a sense of what they can personally do to build their community, and on the other hand, there must be a structure for assembling residents into a structure for building collective action within the community. Informants spoke of the need to leverage resources from all neighborhoods, and take collective action toward more broadly-defined community goals. They feel that this strategy builds community power, efficacy, and identity and is more successful in effecting change. The informants also felt that the schools, businesses and faith communities must work closely with any efforts, whether learning to identify and address problems or being integrated as a pivotal agent for change themselves. Schools in particular are seen as potential hubs of community development. It was noted that some faith communities are commuter-oriented and may not have the direct involvement of community residents, others are viewed as not working in collaboration with each other, and others engage in social outreach primarily to expand their membership. Nonetheless, the faith communities are viewed as an essential component of community building and problem-solving, and should be understood as a critical component of community engagement strategy.

Theme 7: Invest in Leadership Development, Training and Education

Whatever investments are made, the resulting programs and processes must be able to be sustained by the community once the investments are completed. In many ways, the informants emphasized the need to cultivate skilled and committed individuals who can be trained and guided into community leadership roles. In turn, these new leaders can be equipped with the skills to train and guide other residents to become community leaders. This was a pervasive theme. Many informants suggested that empowering residents through the cultivation of community leadership skills can be more productive than providing financial support for purely program or service support. Innovation could be cultivated among volunteers, and can create energy that inspires the neighborhood to take responsibility both for their lives and the community. Toward this end, one informant recommended that investments should fund a resident to spearhead this leadership development process. That resident could serve as a consistent point of contact in the community for up to a two-year period.
Theme 8: Create an Alliance of Providers

Many informants pointed to the necessity to create greater and more effective relationships among the many service providers operating within the community. Building collaborative spirit not only maximizes the awareness of resources among organizations and within the community, but it also paves the way for greater efficiency in responding to community needs, sharing of resources, and the incubation of innovative programming where missions overlap. Some suggested that regularly scheduled forums for service providers would not only increase communication, but also set the stage for building more innovative and sustainable programming. Two informants indicated that Friendly House and the Phoenix Revitalization Corporation hold great potential for a particularly strong and cohesive partnership that would positively and substantially impact the community.

Theme 9: Encourage Firefighters to Expand Roles in the Central City South Community

Some key informants perceived that the Phoenix Fire Department does not have a strong presence in the Central City South community. Necessary precautions such as keeping the local firehouse door locked for security purposes may perpetuate the belief the firefighters are largely disengaged from community initiatives. While key informants acknowledged that real challenges inspire these precautions, they interfere with community outreach and the perception of the firefighters. The department’s image will need to be transformed if the broader firefighting community is to be successful in infusing the FireStar mission into the community.

In general, however, the informants do feel that firefighters are viewed by communities as community assistants, and even servants that stand ready to provide aid when needed. This perception is very positive, and can be capitalized upon as firefighters mobilize their efforts in Central City South. The informants also note that many residents are yearning for greater engagement of the firefighters as an integral portion of the fabric of the community. If they can assist the community in accomplishing its vision, the positive firefighter presence can be even further enhanced.

Challenges in Central City South – Key Informants

While it is important to build an investment strategy focusing on community assets, it is nevertheless important to recognize the challenges facing the Central City South community though the lens of key informants. As the key informants focused on the general question of what are the core challenges of the community that might have bearing on establishing priorities for FireStar investments, twelve themes emerged. These twelve themes, reported below, capture the richness and scope of comments made across the sixteen interviews.

Grocery Supplies. The informants noted that Central City South is in need of a resource for quality food supplies, such as a grocery store or farmer’s market. The small markets and convenience store operations immediately available to residents are disproportionately stocked with foods of relatively low nutritional and health value. Certain transportation services that provided access to large grocery stores outside of the community have ceased operation.

Healthcare. Concerns about the adequacy of healthcare in Central City South arose repeatedly across the informant interviews. There is concern that the only hospital immediately serving the community provides an inadequate range of services because it does not offer a public clinic and only specialized facilities that require health insurance. Some informants pointed to the reality that many residents do
not have the resources to purchase medical supplies such as asthma inhalers or diabetic strips. There is also concern that residents lack knowledge of resources that are available to assist them. One informant noted that the ASU College of Nursing’s downtown health center can assist with the healthcare inadequacies by providing low-cost health care for approximately $100/year via nurse practitioners. Also, it was noted that residents could benefit from information cards or collateral to inform them of available healthcare options and resources.

Vacant Buildings. Numerous informants noted the prevalence of vacant buildings and land parcels. Concern was expressed about the proportion of demolished and vacant homes in comparison to permits to build. There was recognition of the impactful damage being perpetuated on the home occupancy by freeways, the airport, industrial uses, overhead power lines and relatively poor access to mass transport. One informant simply stated that it seems no one wants to move into the community on a permanent basis. In addition to these concerns, it was noted that vacant dwelling units and buildings are being used as rotating bars by groups such as the Hell’s Angels – rendering dangerous and volatile neighborhood conditions.

Revitalization. The need to address poor housing quality through focused revitalization activity emerged numerous times across the interviews. Informants suggested the need for code enforcement, renovation, cleanups, gardens, and streetscape enhancements.

Seniors. Informants pointed to the needs of the senior community in Central City South. There is a sense that seniors need to be educated regarding resources available to them that provide the assistance they may require. The role of education was highlighted as a tool for thwarting victimization by others, including home repair scams, identity theft, and other forms of predatory behavior. One informant sensed that that this population might be particularly underserved since efforts directed toward seniors may not serve as a strong publicity vehicle for funders. Another noted, due to facilities closing in other communities, senior-oriented facilities in Central City South were experiencing overflow because of increased demand.

Gangs and Violence. The subject of gangs and violence occurred three times. One informant described the area west of 7th Avenue to 15th Avenue as a “war zone.” The overall South Phoenix area experiences high numbers of gun violence. It was mentioned that engaging youth and offering alternatives to gang life is critical.

Rental Population. Informants noted that Central City South is home to a predominantly transient rental population. Non-responsive absentee landlords create low housing quality conditions for these residents. One informant noted that communities such as Central City South suffer in terms of crime rate because a large percentage of released prisoners can rent in these communities as opposed to other areas of the county.

Parks. The informants cited the importance of available parks and recreation services as a critical quality of life issue for Central City South residents – particularly for youth. Furthermore, parks and recreation services were noted as important arenas for building multi-cultural and inter-generational connections, and – in general – community cohesion.

Individual Development. The need for programming to facilitate individual development was also a focus of the informants. Priority areas include job training, computer training, job fairs, financial management, and leadership development.
Economic Development. A few informants made note of the inadequacy of economic development support systems. It was noted that private enterprise should be encouraged to invest new businesses in the community or re-invest in existing businesses in order to expand business prospects and create needed jobs.

Transportation. Some expressed concern that transportation options to and from Central City South are limited. One informant noted that the residents have been continually denied requests for a transportation connector system to the area. Another expressed concern that some residents are not knowledgeable of what transportation options are available to them.

Homelessness. The challenge of homelessness was mentioned by two informants. Due to the increase in the homeless population and the relative proximity of homeless services and shelters to Central City South, a migration track of homeless populations has emerged through the community. This migration is intensified when nearby services and shelters turn away the homeless due to excess demand.

Potential Contributions of Firefighters -- Key Informants

As informants reflected on the question of how firefighters might contribute to community development efforts beyond their traditional emergency response and life-saving roles, they generally drew from their knowledge of the role firefighters have played in other public service campaigns that they have witnessed. Suggestions included performing tasks such as home safety evaluation, code violation evaluation, smoke detector inspection and installation, education regarding fall prevention, lift assistance, volunteer labor to help build and repair homes, and referrals to services that can help with home safety issues and general well-being. Informants noted that firefighters participating in door-to-door walks with community development program representatives have been successful in the past in establishing trust with the resident and possible introduction into the home. It was also noted that open houses at the fire station, providing ride-along opportunities, and bringing fire trucks and equipment to community events was always positive for the community.

Discussions also centered on the inherent value of firefighters directly interacting with community residents and otherwise becoming more visible in the Central City South community. Informants felt that firefighters should regularly participate in community meetings along with other providers. Other suggestions included the notion that firefighters could be trained to become involved in community building activities beyond traditional roles of emergency response training. Or, they could also become facilitators in the community and lend guidance to specific community building activities such as bridging racial gaps or mentoring adult residents in the development of an intramural program. It was also suggested that firefighters could become intentional in amplifying conditions that build community connectivity. As an example, if a farmer’s market was formed, the firefighters could purchase all their produce through that activity to show support of the community efforts.

It should be noted that recent budget cuts have limited the firefighter’s direct involvement in and capacity to help neighborhoods. However they have recruited volunteers to assist in their work of integrating into neighborhoods in order to better utilize the programs that currently exist under the union structure that address safety issues, such examples being installing pool fences, training on the proper use of car seats, and inspection and installation of smoke alarms.
Methodology 5: Community Asset Mapping

If FireStar investments in Central City South are to be successful, they must utilize existing organizational structures and leverage processes already in place in the community. As part of the assessment process, an inventory of existing educational institutions, faith communities, health services, community-based groups and committees, neighborhood associations and block watch groups, parks, housing, historic and eligible properties, nonprofit and social service organizations, head start programs, governmental organizations, other assets, and businesses serving or located within the community was completed. This inventory is presented in Appendix B, and supplements the comprehensive inventory provided by the publication Central City South at a Glance for neighborhoods west of Central Avenue (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2009).

The inventory suggests that Central City South has a broad range of assets to draw upon to meet the needs of the neighborhood and grow its quality of life. It shows:

- Over one hundred businesses serve the Central City South community.
- Five schools (including two charter schools) are embedded in the community.
- The community has eighteen faith communities or faith-based centers.
- One government planning entity and one non profit program have operations within the community.
- An additional nine government agencies or programs have anchor human service operations in the community.
- Eleven nonprofit human service organizations operations are based in the community.
- Five health care agencies or centers have operations within the community, including one extended care hospital and one behavioral health clinic.
- The community has two senior centers.
- Six public parks and recreation facilities exist within the community, yet two of these resources are currently closed due to budget constraints.
- The Harmon Park Library was opened in August of 2009.
- There are three service clubs with facilities in the community.
- The community has five housing complexes with existing or potential community programming.
- At least eight neighborhood associations, block watch groups, or advisory committees exist within the community and are registered with City of Phoenix Neighborhood Services Department.
- Six funding organizations have collaborated (via the Phoenix Neighborhood Development Collaborative) to synchronize investments in the community.
- VSUW funds targeted initiatives in the community that focus on financial stability and early childhood development.

Many of the assets in the community are part of the work of VSUW, which has a long history in Central City South, having funded several partner agencies in the area since as far back as 1940. This trend continues, and there are several organizations and programs in Central City South that receive funding due to their alignment to VSUW’s community objectives. A list of these partners can be found in Appendix B.

VSUW’s connection to additional organizations and programs outside of Central City South may also help FireStar leverage resources. If FireStar’s prioritization process identifies an unfulfilled need in the
community as part of the action plan, and VSUW has an existing partner agency in a geographic region outside of Central City South that serves this need, partners will aim to bring that service to Central City South. The overarching goal is to layer programs and services so as to achieve maximal impact.

An important role of the FireStar investments is to capitalize on the existence of these assets and leverage their capacity as funding strategies are determined.

Methodology 6: Review of National Literature and Best Practices

A National Best Practice Model

As the introduction to this report makes clear, all forms of assessment for this community assessment were anchored in nationally-recognized “best practices” for community development. One of the key ambitions of this assessment was to ensure that:

- Core insights from asset-based community development (ABCD) planning methodology were reflected in preparation of this report
- Nationally-accepted approaches to assessment and scanning were followed, and
- Core insights about effective action plan development and asset-based intervention strategies were considered.

In the national literature, much has been written about what constitutes key components of a healthy and vital neighborhood – and what can be done from an intervention perspective to help a neighborhood achieve maximum health and vitality (Kretzmann & McKnight 1993; Redefining Progress 1997; Green and Haines 2002; National Association of Planning Councils 2002; Anderson, Scrimshaw, Fullilove, and Fielding 2003; Phillips 2003; Mattessich, Monsey, & Roy, 2004; Jozsa and Brown 2005; Reed, Frasier and Doughill 2006; National Civic League 2008; Urban Institute 2010).

Key insights from the national perspective are most succinctly captured by the work of Anderson et al. (2003). Their work describes the results of a national Task Force on Community Preventive Services organized under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to summarize what is known about the effectiveness of community-based interventions to improve the health of communities.

Their comprehensive review, which has been validated by subsequent research, revealed six primary characteristics of a healthy community:

- Quality Neighborhood Living Conditions
- Quality Employment
- Adequate Health and Human Service Programs
- Opportunities for Learning and Developing Personal Capacity
- Strong Civic Engagement
- Positive Community Norms, Customs, and Processes

In general, the characteristics that define Quality Neighborhood Living Conditions include housing quality and safety, safe neighborhoods, affordable housing, strong social support systems, and strong
business and community organizations. *Quality Employment Opportunities* include economic viability for local businesses and workforce training and support for residents. *Adequate Health and Human Service Programs* are necessary to provide basic life quality support systems for community residents. *Opportunities for Learning and Developing Personal Capacity* include early childhood learning opportunities, strong K-12 systems, good recreation and socialization activities, and life-long learning opportunities. *Strong Civic Engagement* is essential to promote community identity and individual action for the common good. Finally, *Strong Community Norms, Customs, and Processes* are important for building community cohesion, and, for individuals, a sense of effectiveness in contributing to a larger whole.

Importantly, Anderson et al. (2003) addressed the question of how to work with each of these six characteristics to build stronger communities. For each of the six characteristics, they identified key indicator variables that would define “success” if the characteristic was fully present. In this report, indicator variables will interchangeably be expressed as desired outcomes. They then drew upon the work of the National Task Force on Community Preventive Services, and identified over 200 community-based intervention strategies that could be employed to move a community toward such “success.” Importantly, the PCD has identified additional key indicator variables and intervention strategies that have been brought to light since the Anderson et al. (2003) review. A summary of the key indicator variables, and specific examples of associated intervention strategies, is provided in Table 3.

The national framework presented in Table 3 is important for two reasons:

- First, it provides a structure for identifying specific action strategies that could be implemented by the FireStar program in light of the vision, assets, needs, and opportunities highlighted within this report.

- Second, the information underscores the need to focus on building intervention strategies targeted to long-term structural change in the community – as opposed to short-term activities that focus on short-term gains.

Short-term activities include those that produce a very real and tangible benefit to the community – but do not strike at the heart of the conditions that precipitated the need for the activity in the first place. Examples might be neighborhood clean-ups, fire code enforcement, and housing hazard elimination.

Long-term investment strategies seek ways for outside resources (such as FireStar) to work with existing community assets (organizations, businesses, education systems, and residents) to create enduring change in the way community assets are organized to serve the community well. Primarily, the matrix of Table 3 points FireStar investments away from short-term “in and out of the community” investments and more toward long term investments that promote sustainable change in the community over time.
Table 3. Key Indicators of a Healthy Neighborhood and Corollary Intervention Strategies (Adapted from Anderson et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Neighborhood Indicators/Desired Outcomes*</th>
<th>Example of Intervention Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1: Quality Neighborhood Living Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing quality</td>
<td>• Programs to abate housing hazards (lead paint removal, rodent extermination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fire safety protection (e.g., inspections, detector checks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe neighborhoods</td>
<td>• Neighborhood Watch programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rapid access to emergency personnel (e.g., fire, police, and EMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>• Support for subsidized housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing units for low-income, single adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, improving, and retaining neighborhood assets</td>
<td>• Increase neighborhood businesses and home-based enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase cultural organizations and citizen associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood cohesion and strong social support systems</td>
<td>• Mentoring programs (e.g., Big Brothers/Sisters, youth business mentoring, adopt-a senior programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neighborhood planning to increase public meeting spaces (e.g., plazas, parks, trails, local open space/centers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 2: Quality Employment Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>• Small loans to support locally owned businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local business clubs as resource for business owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, workforce development and employment opportunities</td>
<td>• Volunteer programs to mentor students in diverse occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality, affordable child care for workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The matrix is adapted from the state-of-science review provided by Anderson et al (2003). A ** in Column 1 designates supplemental key indicator variables/intervention strategies identified by the PCD based upon its review of community health research generated since the Anderson et al (2003) review.
### Component 3: Adequate Health and Human Services Programs

| Community-defined goals for health and human service programs | • Community participation in health and human service decision-making  
| Ensure health and human service programs are accessible | • Collaboration between health and human services and broader social, economic, and political sectors  
| Ensure health and human service programs are culturally appropriate | • Use of media for community health education and raising of awareness of health and human service programs  
| Ensure health and human service programs are culturally appropriate | • Seed new multicultural providers into community  
| Encourage health and disease prevention in schools/workplace | • Health education materials in multiple languages  
| Monitoring community health indicators | • Health indicators (e.g., preventable morbidity and mortality or health disparities)  
| Monitoring community health indicators | • Socioeconomic indicators (e.g., rates of employment, crime, or housing availability; surveys of quality community life)  
| Enhance public transportation systems** | • Dial-a-ride programs  
| Enhance public transportation systems** | • Enhance bus stop safety and amenities  
| Strengthen core educational systems** | • Implement best practice math/science programs  
| Strengthen core educational systems** | • Increase learning technology/software  
| Strong community-based institutions and local anchors** | • Provide capacity building technical assistance to local nonprofit organizations  
| Strong community-based institutions and local anchors** | • Provide grants for anchor institution expansion

* The matrix is adapted from the state-of-science review provided by Anderson et al (2003). A ** in Column 1 designates supplemental key indicator variables/intervention strategies identified by the PCD based upon its review of community health research generated since the Anderson et.al (2003) review.
**Component 4: Opportunities for Learning and Developing Personal Capacity**

| Early learning and child development opportunities | • Child development programs (e.g., Head Start)  
| | • High quality foster care programs |
| Broaden educational support systems | • Schools as sites for human service support systems (e.g., after-school programs, parenting programs, or community support programs)  
| | • Senior citizens serving as models and mentors in schools |
| Arts, culture, recreation and leisure activities for all ages | • Increased non-profit organizations (e.g., YMCA/YWCA programs, Boys and Girls Clubs)  
| | • Community sports for youth |
| Life-long learning environment | • Leadership development for all ages  
| | • Adult education programs |

**Component 5: Opportunities for Strong Civic Engagement**

| Civic engagement in communities | • Voter registration drives  
| | • Active civic clubs (e.g., Rotary, volunteer firefighters, parent-teacher associations) |
| Social engagement in neighborhoods/communities | • Neighborhood social clubs  
| | • Community centers or facilities for group meetings |
| Community infrastructure to maximize local decision-making | • Training in negotiation/mediation skills for community groups  
| | • Re-enforcement of cultural heritage to build common interests (e.g., language courses or Saturday schools to teach ethnic group customs and art) |
| Resource and idea contributions from community organizations** | • Action planning training programs  
| | • Neighborhood-based volunteering programs |
| Self-reliance for community resource development** | • Grant writing assistance  
| | • Advocacy training |

*The matrix is adapted from the state-of-science review provided by Anderson et al (2003). A ** in Column 1 designates supplemental key indicator variables/intervention strategies identified by the PCD based upon its review of community health research generated since the Anderson et.al (2003) review.*
**Component 6: Positive Community Customs, Norms, and Processes**

| Increase social solidarity and understanding across diverse groups/cultures | ● Anti-stigma campaigns (AIDS, mental illness, etc.)  
● Diversity training in schools and workplaces |
| --- | --- |
| Focal point for community growth and social support activities through religious organizations | ● Provide locations for social support, leisure and spiritual fulfillment  
● Provide outlets for members to provide community service |
| Community embracing of multicultural beliefs and customs | ● Neighborhood multicultural festivals  
● Multicultural training for care providers |
| Innovative programming for community centers/socialization activities | ● Opportunities for after-school programs  
● Provide senior and youth programs that provide alternative to unsupervised leisure (e.g., music, sports, and art) |
| Maximize democratic norms for equal voice and influence for all community members | ● Increased community voice in local government  
● Encouragement of accountability of public agencies |
| Broad-scale ownership in community visioning, goal formation, and strategic action planning processes** | ● Use of national best practices of community-based planning  
● Full representation of all residents and community-based organizations in decision-making |
| Vibrant involvement of business leaders in creating community vision** | ● Community think tanks of business entrepreneurs  
● Chambers of Commerce involved in social challenge discussions |
| Increase individual, social, organizational, and economic entrepreneurial activity and innovation for the public good** | ● Hosted think tanks on community futures  
● Workshops on technology incubator, venture capital, and social entrepreneurship |

* The matrix is adapted from the state-of-science review provided by Anderson et al (2003). A ** in Column 1 designates supplemental key indicator variables/intervention strategies identified by the PCD based upon its review of community health research generated since the Anderson et al (2003) review.
The Healthy Communities Model

In addition to describing core dimensions of healthy communities, another important contribution of the community development literature is the notion that there are stages of progression in the health and vitality of communities. (Roseland 2005; Emory and Flora 2006). The suggests that there are life cycles in communities, just as there are in business, economics, politics, families, and other social systems. While certain communities may remain stable over time (a sustainable community), it is also possible that they are progressing upward toward greater health and vitality (a revitalizing community) or are spiraling downward toward lower health and vitality (a deteriorating community).

Thus, there are dynamics in communities – and every community is at a different place in terms of (a) closeness to the ideal of maximum health and vitality and (b) whether they are progressing toward the ideal, spiraling down away from the ideal, or relatively stable – moving neither toward or away from the ideal. From a community investment perspective, the literature suggests that communities in different life cycle stages would benefit from different forms of investment. In other words, what is appropriate for one community at one cycle stage would be inappropriate for another community at a different life cycle stage. And, what is appropriate for a relatively stable community, would be inappropriate for a community that is progressing upwards or downwards in a life cycle (Emery and Flora 2006).

In partnership with the VSUW, the PCD has developed a Healthy Communities Model to capture the essence of these principles that have emerged in the literature. The model is visually portrayed in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. The Healthy Communities Model.](image)

The Healthy Communities Model suggests that from a community development perspective, there are four broad categories of communities that are differentiated by their relative proximity to the ideal of an optimally healthy and vibrant community.
Level 1: Safety and Security

Communities at the base of the triangle (referred to as “Level 1” communities) are characterized by basic needs for Safety and Security. In terms of community health and vibrancy, they are furthest from the ideal. Communities at this level have prevailing threats to human safety and security – psychologically, physically, and economically. More often than not, these communities have high levels of crime, social discord, poverty, blight, unemployment, and low economic vitality. Such communities require strong infusion of safety net services, typically by service providers with revenue streams available external to the community.

Level 2: Capacity Building

The next stage of progression is characterized by the focus on Capacity Building. While basic safety net services are in place, these communities have limited internal capacity to respond to community challenges and aspirations. Investments for communities at this level focus on building basic infrastructure to increase access to services and growth of economic engines. While there is an eye for the development of self-generating community processes, the reality is that much of the support for capacity building is flowing from sources outside of the community. Investments are oriented to strengthening businesses, nonprofit organizations, service providers, government distribution systems, transportation, and other community-based institutions so that there is more capacity, effectiveness and efficiency in the response to community needs. In some cases, investments encourage the establishment of anchor institutions (e.g., nonprofits, banks, grocers, counseling services) that have strong presence in other communities but underdeveloped (or absent) presence in these communities.

Level 3: Self-Sufficiency

The third level describes communities that have relatively high levels of Self-Sufficiency. Community-based organizations are responding well to community needs and aspirations, and are generating the necessary resources to expand services and programs. Educational support systems are being broadened and expanded to inter-generational and lifelong enterprises, as are arts, culture, recreation and leisure programs. Leadership and civic engagement programs are prevalent, and there is strong focus on mobilizing community assets in ways that maximize long-term sustainability of programs. Investments tend to focus on broadening the system of community services and programs beyond the core typically found in Level 2 communities. Sustainability is addressed through the infusion of national best practice frameworks and processes, and technical assistance programs targeted toward developing self-reliant community processes and organizations.

Level 4: Resiliency and Empowerment

Communities at the apex of the triangle are characterized by Resiliency and Empowerment. In terms of community health and vibrancy, these communities are closest to the ideal. These communities are resilient, vibrant, innovative, entrepreneurial, visionary, and are of such vibrancy that they contribute to the life quality and economic energies of surrounding neighborhoods. All components of the community (residents, organizations, institutions) are maximally engaged in community visioning processes, and the voices of diverse perspectives are respected and honored. Such communities are characterized by high levels of trust, reciprocity, mutual respect, impactful collaborations, and economic and life quality growth. They not only respond efficiently and effectively to adversity and threat, but flourish by developing innovative solutions to these phenomena. Investments in these communities
tend to focus on entrepreneurial education, building connectivity to the knowledge and creative class sectors, and establishing ties to global economies.

In summary, the Healthy Communities Model suggests that there is a spectrum of communities distinguished by their proximity to an ideal. Some communities are punctuated with social and economic challenges and have developed dependency on external support systems. Others are self-reliant, entrepreneurial and have strong support systems for individuals, families, organizations and institutions in search of vibrant places in which to grow. As the “Health Spiral” insert in Figure 3 implies, the focus of neighborhood investment programs is to empower all neighborhoods to “spiral up” toward a state of optimal health and vibrancy (Emory and flora 2006).

In this “spiraling” context, the greater the characteristics of a Level 1 community are prevalent in a neighborhood, the greater the focus should be on infusing the most basic of safety-net services. At the same time, the long range goal is also to build community capacity (Level 2), self-sufficiency (Level 3), and ultimately the kind of resiliency and empowerment (Level 4) that generates the highest levels of community health and vibrancy. Therefore, investments should be tailored to the specific character of a neighborhood as defined by the Healthy Communities Model. At the same time, investment programs must always carry the long-range vision for propelling each neighborhood toward a Level 4 status. Thus, while the greatest share of resources from community investment programs must be tailored to the current state of a neighborhood, the distributions of investments can be broadened to set the foundation for migration away from dependency and toward optimal health and vibrancy.

**Key Intervention Strategies**

Informed by the results of national research, the PCD partnered with VSUW to develop a logic model that frames the specific investment options that are affiliated with each level of the Healthy Communities Model. This logic model is presented in Appendix E.

The investment options precisely mirror the key indicators of community health as defined by research and summarized in Table 3. In that Table, all of the indicators surrounding Component 1 (Quality Living Conditions) and Component 2 (Quality Employment Opportunities) are directly germane to Level 1 (Safety and Security) conditions in the Model. Therefore, they are inserted into the logic model as being most directly tailored to Level 1 communities. Next, all of the indicators surrounding Component 3 (Adequate Health and Human Services Programs) are directly germane to Level 2 (Capacity Building) conditions. Then, all of the indicators surrounding Component 4 (Opportunities for Learning and Developing Personal Capacity) and Component 5 (Opportunities for Strong Civic Engagement) are aligned with Level 3 (Self-Sufficiency) conditions. Finally, all the indicators associated with Component 6 (Positive Community Customs, Norms, and Processes) pertain to Level 4 (Resiliency and Empowerment).

The logic model also shows examples of programs that might be funded under each investment option. Moreover, as with all logic models, linkages are shown between program outputs, outcomes, and ultimately impacts.

In making investments, it is important to remember that the ultimate goal is to help all communities move toward a Level 4 community (Resiliency and Empowerment). Thus, while investments should be predominately tailored according to provisions of the Healthy Communities Model (see p. 43), it is also true that some investments should be made across all four Levels to ensure that the community keeps moving toward (or remaining at) a Level 4 community. In making these determinations, it is important
to consider what specific forms of investments would most quickly move a community toward (or remain at) a Level 4 community – and do so in a sustainable way.

While the logic model is complex, the implications of the logic model are not. The model suggests that investments must be key to the character of neighborhood conditions. It also suggests that these investments must also be organized around specific desired outcomes -- outcomes that articulate exactly how each program will help move a neighborhood toward its ideal. It further suggests that specific programs that are chosen for funding must be prioritized in terms of their capacity to create these desired outcomes.

And importantly, the model suggests that program outputs, outcomes and impacts need to be monitored over time to ensure that the outcomes that are desired are indeed being created by the programs that are funded. Only in this way, can movement toward a healthier, vibrant community be expected.

Methodology 7: Action Planning and Priority-Setting Process

This methodology called for the engagement of the Neighborhood Advocacy Team to develop action plans for FireStar investments based on the information contained in this assessment. The process for decision-making was articulated in the first draft of this scan, which was sent to Neighborhood Advocacy Team members immediately after its first meeting on November 3rd, 2010. That process is reproduced in its entirety below:

The Neighborhood Advocacy Team will be meeting to discuss the results of this assessment and develop a strategy for guiding FireStar investments within the Central City South neighborhood. The members will be convened by VSUW, Friendly House, and the PCD will facilitate the sequence of meetings that will determine initial desired outcomes of the program and priority areas of Central City South asset activities to be considered for FireStar investment.

Thus, this methodology calls for a seven part process:

1. Assemble members for this project into a Neighborhood Advocacy Team
2. Convene Neighborhood Advocacy Team to review results of this assessment
3. Develop an action plan to guide community FireStar investments (based upon healthy neighborhood indicators)
4. Determine specific projects to fund
5. Empower Friendly House to implement projects as defined by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team
6. Monitor progress of FireStar investments through formative and summative evaluations
7. Calibrate FireStar investments as needed

During the first meeting of the Neighborhood Advocacy Team, members will be given a draft of this assessment and its major findings will be presented. Before the presentation on assessment results, there will be discussion of the FireStar mission and the context for creating focus on the specific Central City South community defined for this project. Then, major themes emerging from each of the above six methodologies will be reviewed: vital signs assessment, review of past studies, results of community conversations, key informant interviews, community asset mapping, and best practices assessment of
community health indicators. Key investment guidelines developed through the assessment will also be reviewed. After the presentation of results, there will be time for preliminary discussion of the findings and clarification of core issues. Then, the Neighborhood Advocacy Team will be instructed to reflect on the findings, and to prepare for the process linking healthy neighborhood indicators (Table 3, p. 39) with themes that emerged from the assessment, and the ultimate selection and prioritization of investments to be made in the community.

During the second meeting of the Neighborhood Advocacy Team, the emergent themes of the report again will be summarized. Then, the Neighborhood Advocacy Team will be asked to engage in a process that prioritizes the key community health indicators around which FireStar investments are to be organized (see Table 3, p. 39). This process will be completed through use of procedures such as Decreasing Options Technique (DOT) voting. The process will be informed by many forms of input reflecting all dimensions of the assessment. Members will be asked to identify and prioritize investment options that (a) reflect the mission of FireStar, (b) reflect agreed upon investment guidelines (such as those delineated beginning on page 16 of this assessment), and (c) reflect the needs and aspirations of the community identified in the assessment.

As one form of input into the process, the participants will be asked to reflect upon possible linkages among the key community health indicators identified by the national scientific community (Table 3, p. 39), needs and aspirations of the community identified in its Quality of Life Plan (see p. 28), and community challenges identified by the key informants (see p. 33).

One way to summarize the possible alignments is presented graphically on the following pages. The middle column lists the set of healthy neighborhood indicators affiliated with each of the four levels of the Healthy Communities Model (p. 43). These are the essential building blocks for a healthy community as identified by scientific research. The right column lists the quality of life strategies identified by the Central City South community in its Quality of Life Plan. The nine strategies of the Plan are presented in a way that shows possible alignment with each level in the Healthy Communities Model. The left column presents specific challenges identified by the Key Informants. They also are presented in a way that shows alignment with the four levels of the Healthy Communities Model. Thus, a structure of formed to view the possible intersections between community vision, community challenges, and the nationally-defined ideal of a healthy community. For the participants, this will shed further light on which particular desired outcomes should be emphasized in the prioritization process.

The following four figures present the desired outcomes, resident strategies and key informant challenges organized according to the Healthy Communities Model levels.
### Level 1: Provide Safety and Security

#### Key Informant Challenges to Address

- **GROCERY SUPPLIES:**
  - Grocery or Farmer’s Market

- **VACANT BUILDINGS:**
  - Occupation

- **REVITALIZATION:**
  - Renovation & Demolition
    - Cleanups
    - Gardens

- **GANGS AND VIOLENCE:**
  - Engage Youth
  - Offer Alternatives

- **RENTAL POPULATION:**
  - Absentee Landlords

- **PARKS:**
  - Multicultural Connections
  - Intergenerational Connections

- **TRANSPORTATION:**
  - Better Options/Access
  - Improved Awareness

- **HOMELESSNESS:**
  - Migration Track
  - Living on Vacant Lots

#### Healthy Neighborhood Indicators/Desired Outcomes

- **Aligned with Component 1:**
  - Quality Neighborhood Living Conditions
    *(see page 39)*

  - *Increase housing quality*

  - *Stabilize safety of neighborhood*

  - *Encourage development / availability of affordable housing*

  - *Facilitate building, improvement & retention of neighborhood assets*

  - *Strengthen neighborhood cohesion and social support systems*

#### PNDC/PRC Resident Strategies

- **HOUSING:**
  - Occupation Improvement Development

- **TRANSPORTATION:**
  - Maintenance Better Access

- **GOLDEN THREAD 2:**
  - Community Safety

- **GOLDEN THREAD 3:**
  - Beautification
### Level 2: Build Capacity

#### Key Informant Challenges to Address

**HEALTHCARE:**
- Affordable & Accessible Resource Awareness

**SENIORS:**
- Underserved by Providers Resource Awareness
- Protected from Victimization Sr. Centers Over Capacity

#### Healthy Neighborhood Indicators/Desired Outcomes

- **Aligned with Component 2:**
  - Quality Employment Opportunities *(see page 39)*

- **& Component 3:**
  - Adequate Health and Human Services Programs *(see page 40)*

- **Promote economic viability**
- **Increase opportunities for workforce development and employment**
- **Facilitate development of community goals for health & human services programs**
- **Ensure health and human services are accessible**
- **Ensure health and human services are culturally appropriate**
- **Encourage health promotion/disease prevention in schools/workplace**
- **Monitor community health indicators**
- **Enhance public transportation systems**
- **Strengthen core educational systems**
- **Strengthen community-based institutions and local anchors**

#### PNDC/PRC Resident Strategies

- **RECREATION:**
  - Intergenerational & Multicultural Programs
  - Celebrating “Streets of Golden Threads” Stories
  - Expanded Experiences

- **HEALTH:**
  - Awareness
  - Education Facility Partners

- **SERVICES:**
  - Service Provider Relationships
  - Service Expansion Resource Awareness

- **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:**
  - Amenities/Businesses Services Resources Retail Employment
# Level 3: Attain Self-Sufficiency

## Key Informant Challenges to Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT:</th>
<th>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>Private Enterprise Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Training</td>
<td>New Business Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Fairs</td>
<td>Existing Business Reinvestment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Healthy Neighborhood Indicators/Desired Outcomes

- **Aligned with Component 4:** Opportunities for Learning & Developing Personal Capacity *(see page 41)*
- **& Component 5:** Opportunities for Strong Civic Engagement *(see page 41)*

- Provide early learning and child development opportunities
- Broaden educational support systems
- Provide arts, culture, recreation and leisure activities for all ages
- Develop a life-long learning environment
- Promote civic engagement in neighborhood/community
- Increase opportunities for social engagement in communities
- Strengthen community infrastructure to maximize local decision making
- Increase resource and idea contributions from local organizations
- Increase self-reliance for community resource development

## PNDC/PRC Resident Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Education Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Level 4: Achieve Resiliency & Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant Challenges to Address</th>
<th>Healthy Neighborhood Indicators/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>PNDC/PRC Resident Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CROSS CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING*: A Positive Mindset Active Engagement in Community Development Resident Empowerment</td>
<td><strong>Aligned with Component 6:</strong> Positive Community Customs, Norms, and Processes <em>(see page 42)</em> Increase social solidarity and understanding across diverse groups/cultures Vibrant involvement of faith-based organizations in social support Community embracing of multicultural beliefs and customs Innovative programming for community centers/socialization activities Maximize democratic norms and equal voice for all members Broad-scale ownership in community visioning, goal formation, and strategic action planning processes Vibrant involvement of business leaders in building community vision Increase individual, social, organizational, and economic entrepreneurial activity and innovation for the public good</td>
<td><strong>GOLDEN THREAD 1:</strong> Pride <strong>GOLDEN THREAD 1-3:</strong> Resident Happiness with Community “Neighbor to Neighbor” Feelings of Helping Each Other Sustain Work Accomplished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: While not listed under challenges in this report, informants did imply that these qualities must become a part of the fabric of community development in order to attain resident investment and sustainability in the Central City South community.
After the community health desired outcomes (desired outcomes) are prioritized, the Members will be adjourned and assembled for a third meeting that focuses on identifying specific programs that will be prioritized for funding to accomplish each of the desired outcomes. Before adjournment, assessment components pertaining to possible options at the specific program level will be reviewed, including those identified by the community conversations, key informant interviews, and the asset-mapping process.

In preparation for the third meeting, Neighborhood Advocacy Team members will be asked to reflect on potential existing programs in the community that could be productively leveraged with FireStar investment. They will also be asked to conduct their own assessment to identify other programs that may hold merit for FireStar investment. And they will be asked to imagine new forms of innovative programming that would propel the community forward.

Next Steps: After Investment Priorities are Established

The action planning phase described above is intended to define the scope and content of FireStar investments in Central City South by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team. The Neighborhood Advocacy Team will then ask Friendly House, the Collaborative Partner for these FireStar investments, to implement the plan through the efforts of the FireStar Coordination Team. The FireStar Coordination Team will be charged to attain information regarding leveraging resources of existing community groups, organizations, and funding whose strategic goals align with the investment focus determined by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team. The quest will be to anchor FireStar investments in ongoing initiatives in ways that will maximize sustainability of the programs that are implemented over time.

As with all successful community investment programs, the model provides for organic change based upon continued community input and the results of monitoring and evaluation. As opportunities arise, other FireStar investments should be considered by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team that may bring added dimensions to program creation and refinement. The scope and composition of the investment focus and community partners may change as early stage programs are completed, and others emerge.

Yet, as the programming unfolds over time, this assessment will serve as an ongoing reference point for the Neighborhood Advocacy Team and FireStar Initiative Partners. It is important to anchor all future decision-making in the basic tenets and principles determined by the FireStar Initiative Partners through this methodology (Methodology 7, see p. 46) of the assessment.
RESULTS OF METHODOLOGY 7

The action planning and priority-setting methodology as stated above called for the creation of a FireStar Neighborhood Advocacy Team that would meet to discuss the results of this assessment and determine and prioritize the specific forms of FireStar investments that were to be made within the Central City South neighborhood. As previously discussed in this assessment, the Neighborhood Advocacy Team was organized in September of 2010, and contains representatives from a variety of community stakeholders and collaborative partners from the education, government, business, faith-community, and non-profit sectors (see p. 10).

Please see Appendix F for the Neighborhood Advocacy Team job description and Appendix G for a listing of Neighborhood Advocacy Team members.

The Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were convened by VSUW and Friendly House, and the PCD facilitated the sequence of meetings that determined the initial indicators of a healthy neighborhood of the FireStar program, priority areas of Central City South asset activities to be considered for FireStar investment, and the framework of communication and investment determination between the FireStar Coordination Team and Neighborhood Advocacy Team members.

The Neighborhood Advocacy Team action planning and priority-setting process commenced on November 3, 2010 and was completed on January 19, 2011. The nature of the process was fully described in an earlier version of this assessment, which the Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were given to review. Below, the process goals are listed and then followed by the action planning and priority-setting decisions that were made by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team members.

Process Goals and Neighborhood Advocacy Team Decisions

The action planning and priority setting process followed a seven-part framework:

1. Assemble members for this project into a Neighborhood Advocacy Team
2. Convene Neighborhood Advocacy Team to review results of this assessment
3. Develop an action plan to guide community FireStar investments (based upon desired outcomes)
4. Determine specific projects to fund
5. Empower Friendly House to implement projects as defined by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team
6. Monitor progress of FireStar investments through formative and summative evaluations
7. Calibrate FireStar investments as needed

The only significant deviation from the action planning and priority setting process (see Methodology 7, p. 46) was that four meetings of Neighborhood Advocacy Team transpired, rather than the prescribed three. The lengthier time-line was created by consensus to offer more time for reflection and additional community information gathering. The meetings were facilitated by ASU’s Partnership for Community Development.
The goals for the process are listed below:

- Discuss the FireStar mission and the context for creating focus on the specific Central City South community defined for this project
- Provide this assessment and its major findings
- Discuss the findings and clarification of core issues
- Review major themes that emerged from each of this assessment’s six methodologies: vital signs assessment, review of past studies, results of community conversations, key informant interviews, community asset mapping, and best practices assessment of community health indicators
- Instruct the Neighborhood Advocacy Team to reflect on the findings, and to prepare for the process linking neighborhood healthy neighborhood indicators (Table 3, p. 39) with themes that emerged from the assessment, and the ultimate selection and prioritization of investments to be made in the community
- Summarize emergent themes of the report
- Review investment guidelines developed through the assessment
- Prioritize the healthy neighborhood indicators around which FireStar investments are to be organized (see Table 3, p. 39)
- The Neighborhood Advocacy Team will be asked to identify and prioritize investment options that:
  - Reflect the mission of FireStar
  - Reflect agreed upon investment guidelines
  - Reflect the needs and aspirations of the community identified in the assessment
  - Reflect upon possible linkages among the key community health indicators identified by:
    - The national scientific community (see Table 3, p. 39)
    - Needs and aspirations of the community identified in its Quality of Life Plan (see p. 28)
    - Community challenges identified by the key informants (see p. 33)
- Identify specific programs that will be prioritized for funding to accomplish each of the desired outcomes

**Meeting 1 - Neighborhood Advocacy Team Decisions (November 3rd, 2010):**

The first meeting of the Neighborhood Advocacy Team was convened on November 3, 2010. This was primarily an information and orientation session. The agenda was organized around five discussion topics:

- Valley of the Sun United Way mission, vision, community objectives, and its conceptual framework of synergistic alignment of organizations to produce the desired community impact
- FireStar as a concept and a process (mission, vision, objectives, the assessment process, investment criteria, decision-making processes)
- Specific roles of FireStar partners (Valley of the Sun United Way, United Phoenix Fire Fighters, City of Phoenix Fire Department, Friendly House, and Neighborhood Advocacy Team Members)
- Presentation of this assessment (reviewing scope and results)
- Overview of the VSUW Healthy Communities Model

At the end of the meeting, Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were instructed to review the assessment report (provided digitally or by hard copy, if requested), reflect on the discussion
points on the day, and determine their long-term commitment to the process. The group was informed that it would re-convene in two weeks to begin the prioritization process.

**Meeting 2 - Neighborhood Advocacy Team Decisions (November 17th, 2010):**

The second Neighborhood Advocacy Team meeting was held on November 17, 2010. The ultimate goal of the meeting was to engage the team in a process that prioritizes the key community health indicators around which FireStar investments are to be organized (see Table 3, p. 39).

A review was conducted of the sections of this assessment (distributed at the November 3rd meeting) devoted to desired outcomes. Then, the Neighborhood Advocacy Team was instructed to review the results of this assessment, reflect on the findings, prepare for the process linking desired outcomes with themes that emerged from the assessment, and prepare for the ultimate prioritization of investments to be made in the community.

Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were informed of the top-rated desired outcomes as revealed by the results of Methodology 3 (Community Conversations) of this assessment. The top-rated desired outcomes were determined by a detailed content analysis by PCD staff of the community conversations data. For every theme that emerged from this analysis, one point was allocated to each and every desired outcome that would align with or be impacted by the theme. The desired outcomes that had the most points are marked by an asterisk below – organized by the four levels of the Healthy Communities Model. Each of these outcomes received between 14 and 22 points each. The remainder received fewer points -- between 2 and 13 points each.

**Level 1: Provide Safety & Security:**

- Facilitate building, improvement & retention of neighborhood assets *
- Strengthen neighborhood cohesion and social support systems *
- Stabilize safety of neighborhood *
- Increase housing quality
- Encourage development/availability of affordable housing

**Level 2: Build Capacity**

- Increase opportunities for workforce development and employment *
- Ensure health and human services are accessible *
- Ensure health and human services are culturally appropriate
- Facilitate development of community goals for health & human services programs
- Promote economic viability
- Strengthen community-based institutions and local anchors
- Encourage health promotion/disease prevention in schools/workplace
- Enhance public transportation systems
- Strengthen core educational systems
- Ensure health and human services are culturally appropriate
Level 3: Attain Self Sufficiency

- Promote civic engagement in neighborhood/community *
- Strengthen community infrastructure to maximize local decision making *
- Reduce reliance on externally generated funding mechanisms
- Provide arts, culture, recreation and leisure activities for all ages
- Increase opportunities for social engagement in communities
- Increase resource and idea contributions from local organizations
- Develop a life-long learning environment
- Provide early learning and child development opportunities
- Broaden educational support systems

Level 4: Achieve Resiliency & Empowerment

- Innovative programming for community centers/socialization activities *
- Broad-scale ownership in community visioning, goal formation, and strategic action planning processes *
- Maximize democratic norms and equal voice for all members
- Community embracing of multicultural beliefs and customs
- Increase individual, social, organizational, and economic entrepreneurial activity and innovation for the public good
- Increase social solidarity and understanding across diverse groups/cultures
- Vibrant involvement of business leaders in building community vision
- Vibrant involvement of faith-based organizations in social support

The above information was presented to the Neighborhood Advocacy Team members in the form of a worksheet. Members were asked to study the worksheets, and designate three outcomes that they perceived should receive priority focus from Central City South FireStar investments. Results were compiled to create a list of the outcomes that received the most designations, and reported to the group. Each designation equaled one point. The two top-rated outcomes received 7 and 8 points each. It is important to note that the third rated outcome received only 3 points. The top two were:

Level 1: PROVIDE SAFETY & SECURITY

- Stabilize safety of neighborhoods

Level 2: BUILD CAPACITY

- Increase opportunities for workforce development and employment

Discussion ensued, and consensus was reached that these two outcomes should define the initial focus of FireStar investments in Central City South.

Further discussion illuminated the need for each Neighborhood Advocacy Team member to serve as a “connector” within the community to identify existing assets and opportunities whose goals can move the community toward achieving these desired outcomes. Each member was asked to conceptualize innovative ways in which FireStar could add capacity to these existing
assets and promote collaborative processes among the many assets of the community. At the end of the discussion, the following guidelines were developed to guide the visioning and investment decision-making process for each Neighborhood Advocacy Team member:

1. What existing programs/organizations are working on efforts that align with the selected desired outcomes?
2. What partners from other sectors, (such as government, education, business, media, non-profit, kinship groups, interest groups, and residents), might engage and expand the impact?
3. Will there be “buy-in” from these potential partners to create a collaborative process?
4. How can FireStar offer leverage? (A suggested budget range per project to consider - $0.00 to $2000.)
5. What can be done to promote self-sustaining longevity for the effort?

At the end of the meeting, Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were asked to bring all the ideas that were generated through this process of self-reflection to the third meeting of the group. Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were also reminded to continue to consult this assessment – particularly focusing on the results of the Community Conversations methodology – as they generated their ideas for FireStar investment.

Meeting 3 - Neighborhood Advocacy Team Decisions (December 15th, 2010):

The third meeting of Neighborhood Advocacy Team transpired on December 15th, 2010. The primary purpose of the meeting was to begin preliminary discussion of the ideas that Neighborhood Advocacy Team members had generated since the second meeting. The meeting included a review of the agreed upon investment guidelines, the roles of Neighborhood Advocacy Team members as “connectors”, the need to align VSUW community objectives to the selected desired outcomes. Hypothetical examples of projects where FireStar investments could add capacity or leverage to existing community projects were given.

As a prelude to discussion of Neighborhood Advocacy Team member ideas for FireStar projects, a handout was provided that listed Central City South challenges or suggestions that pertained to the two selected desired outcomes. This list was compiled as a synthesis of results from Methodology 3 (Community Conversations) of this assessment. During the meeting’s intensive discussion of assets, programs and needs many diverse ideas were generated for shaping FireStar investments that would achieve the desired outcomes identified. Core elements of the discussion were recorded for analysis and synthesis and also to serve as a mechanism for triggering even more ideas among Neighborhood Advocacy Team members. With this objective in mind, a thematic summary of all contributions during the discussion was compiled by the facilitators for use at the fourth meeting.

Meeting 4 - Neighborhood Advocacy Team Decisions (January 19th, 2011):

The final meeting of this sequence was held on January 19, 2011. The primary purpose was to reach consensus on project ideas that could guide investments during the early phases of FireStar investments in Central City South. The meeting began with general business, a review of the incorporation of the community voice throughout the FireStar process, the structure of how continued community feedback
would be incorporated by Neighborhood Advocacy Team members and the FireStar Coordination Team, and a review of the alignment of VSUW objectives with the selected desired outcomes.

For the prioritization process, Neighborhood Advocacy Team members were provided with the thematic summary of contributions generated as a result of the third meeting discussion. A total of 20 possible priority areas were identified. Eleven pertained to the desired outcome, Stabilize safety of neighborhoods, four pertained to the desired outcome Increase opportunities for workforce development and employment, and five had the potential for impacting both outcomes. This information was given to the members, along with a review of the topics of conversation that led to the creation of each theme. The Neighborhood Advocacy Team was then asked to prioritize potential investments by selecting their three top rated priority areas from Desired Outcome 1 and 2, and selecting one top rated priority area from Desired Outcome 3.

**Desired Outcome #1:** Stabilize Safety of the Neighborhood
(Healthy Communities Model Level: 1 - Provide Safety & Security)

**Priority Areas:**
- Quality Food Supply
- Heath Education
- Emergency Assistance
- Health Care
- Security
- Drug Abuse
- Livable Housing
- Neighborhood Cleanup
- Violence Prevention
- Seniors
- Streets

**Desired Outcome #2:** Increase Opportunities for Workforce Development & Employment
(Healthy Communities Model Level: 2 - Build Capacity)

**Priority Areas:**
- Employment Opportunities
- Networking Functions
- Training/Education
- Support Services

**Desired Outcome #3:** Possible impact on all levels.
(Healthy Communities Model Level: Possible impact on all levels.)

**Priority Areas:**
- Engage with "access points" initiative to disseminate resource information within the community
- Promotion of Community Action Association meetings to residents, providers, police and fire
• Collaborate with existing Central City South resource fair to provide smaller neighborhood resource fairs (possibly topic specific) throughout the year
• Train community liaisons to provide each neighborhood community resource information and train new leaders for sustainability purposes
• Assist in development of online site/page posting community resource information

The results of the Neighborhood Advocacy Team member prioritization process narrowed the FireStar Coordination Team focus to the priority areas listed below. Thus, the eight priorities listed will define the focus of initial FireStar investments.

• Quality Food Supply
• Health Education
• Drug Abuse
• Violence Prevention
• Employment Opportunities
• Training/Education
• Train community liaisons to provide each neighborhood community resource information and train new leaders for sustainability purposes
• Engage with "access points" initiative to disseminate resource information within the community

After these priority areas were clarified, the Neighborhood Advocacy Team members began discussing what community partners should be considered for building collaborative relationships that benefit these priority areas. The meeting adjourned with the expectation that the FireStar Coordination Team would explore opportunities for leverage and report on initial FireStar activities to the Neighborhood Advocacy Team at the first quarterly meeting.

Next Steps: After Investment Priorities Have Been Established

The action planning phase described above is intended to define the initial scope and content of FireStar investments in Central City South by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team. The Neighborhood Advocacy Team has charged Friendly House, the Collaborative Partner for these FireStar investments, to implement the plan through the efforts of the FireStar Coordination Team. The FireStar Coordination Team will be charged to attain information of existing community groups, organizations, and funding whose strategic goals align with the selected priority areas for investment which were derived from the prioritized desired outcomes by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team in order to strategize collaborative processes that will leverage resources. The FireStar Coordination Team is also tasked with tracking all FireStar activity within the Central City South community and developing a directory of all assets in the community from their own research and Neighborhood Advocacy Team member feedback.

As with all successful community investment programs, the model provides for organic change based upon continued community input and the results of monitoring and evaluation. As opportunities arise, other FireStar investment opportunities should be considered by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team that may bring added dimensions to program creation and refinement. And, the scope and content of FireStar investments will evolve as early stage programs are completed, and others emerge.
Yet, as the programming unfolds over time, this assessment will serve as an ongoing reference point for the Neighborhood Advocacy Team members. It is important to anchor all future decision-making in the basic tenets and principles determined by the FireStar Initiative Partners through this methodology (Methodology 7) of the assessment.

Now that the initial prioritization process has been completed by Neighborhood Advocacy Team members, it will meet on a quarterly basis for the duration of the FireStar in Central City South process. The FireStar Coordination Team will provide regular report outs of FireStar activities, and the Neighborhood Advocacy Team will have the opportunity to continue to refine existing projects, create new ones aligned to the two selected outcomes (or new outcomes and priority areas determined by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team) as the FireStar program evolves. The quest will be to anchor FireStar investments in ongoing initiatives in ways that will maximize sustainability of the programs that are implemented over time.
SIGNIFICANT “LESSONS LEARNED” FROM THE ASSESSMENT

While the inputs for this assessment are rich and varied, it is clear that four fundamental themes have emerged that are particularly worthy of highlighting at this time:

- Healthy and sustainable communities are built by empowering the residents and organizations within the community – not by outside organizations doing something for the community.
- Effective community development is accomplished by long-term investments in structural change – not by short-term investments intended to “clean up” community “problems.”
- Effective community development happens when many sectors work together in partnership.
- Sustainable community development is achieved when residents are personally engaged in the community development process and implement their own solutions.

Empowering Residents and Organizations

It is clear that Central City South community residents and organizations have a rich array of hopes and aspirations. They are seeking ways to create a better quality of life in Central City South for themselves, their families, their neighbors, and their clients. It is equally clear from research on community building that true community development happens only when assets within the community are mobilized to create change. While external resources are important to a community, these resources – in order to be effective – need to be invested in ways that produce leadership from within the community to create enduring solutions to the challenges the community faces. Residents that are personally engaged in the entire community development process – decision making, recruiting, training, implementing, evaluating – will with each success experience a feeling of ownership, empowerment, and a deeper connection to their community and its future health.

Short-Term Versus Long-Term Investments

There are many ways to invest in the development of a neighborhood. Some investments are immediate, highly visible activities conducted over a relatively short time-frame that produce a specific outcome -- such as a neighborhood clean-up activity. While these investments are important, they may not result in the necessary structural change in a community to perpetuate the desired outcome. Other investments create fundamental changes within a community to bring about long-term solutions to community challenges and long-term opportunities to assist residents in achieving their vision of the ideal.

For example, a short-term needs-based problem-solving approach would have the FireStar investments work for the neighborhood by creating a neighborhood clean-up day and engaging volunteer firefighters in the task of neighborhood clean-up. A long-term asset-based investment strategy would have the same volunteer firefighters working with neighbors to help them create a neighborhood event that would encourage their own clean-up activities and a subsequent celebration of what was accomplished. The former would create a “project” with short-term success. The later would create a “format” for having the neighbors repeat the process on their own accord in the future. From a long term perspective, it is the “format” that will be more successful than the “project” in creating true community development.
Multi-Sector Partnerships

The assessment revealed many facilities, programs and services being provided from diverse organizational sectors serving the Central City South community. A broad range of governmental agencies, faith communities, educational organizations, non-profit organizations, and other community organizations are contributing to neighborhood vitality (Appendix B). Although these organizations are working well independently, it is clear that there are many opportunities for the various entities to join forces to create a synergy to provide a more effective, holistic approach to meeting neighborhood needs and creating structure for the cultivation of leadership toward the community’s ideal. For each prioritized desired outcome identified by the Neighborhood Advocacy Team in Methodology 7, a diverse set of institutions and organizations could consolidate resources and vision to bring focus to strategic action. From this perspective, the greatest power of FireStar investments is in their capacity to facilitate consolidation of existing community assets that currently do not work together. It is fundamentally important to avoid creating new programs that cannot be anchored in existing community initiatives, assets, and processes. Not only that, but a multi-organizational, multi-sector approach would bring more constituents into the community building process, sharpen the efficiency and strategic focus of resource allocation, produce synergy among resources, help unify the community, and create formats for enduring change long after the financial resources of the original FireStar investment have been expended.
BUILDING A HEALTHY CENTRAL CITY SOUTH COMMUNITY

This community assessment documents the rich possibilities for Central City South and the potential role of FireStar investments in effecting positive change within the community. With the goals for FireStar investments clearly established, and anchored in the community vision, the impact will be profound and enduring. Collaborative action and leadership among the residents is needed to focus the community’s assets on achieving self-sufficiency for Central City South. There is much work to do, but the rewards will be great. The resources exist solely to help make a difference in the lives of Central City South residents and to bolster the vitality of its organizations and institutions. The potential accomplishments can make a lasting impression that will continue to help Central City South attain its ideal quality of life over generations to come.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Community Vital Signs

Demographics

Much of the information was extracted from the *U.S. Census Summary File 3, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000*, the City of Phoenix website, and the City of Phoenix Planning Department. All statistics pertain to assessment’s defined planning area for Central City South, unless otherwise noted. It is important to note that while the data represents that which is most currently available (2000 Census); it is nearly one decade dated.

Population

- According to the 2000 Census, the total population was 10,051 individuals. The total population of Phoenix at that time was 3,251,876. Thus, residents of the community comprise less than one-half a percent (0.31%) of the total city population.

Gender

- The population is almost evenly distributed between males and females. Males make up 49.67% (4,993 individuals) of the population and females 50.33% (5,058 individuals).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>10051</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4993</td>
<td>49.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5058</td>
<td>50.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age Distribution

- The median age in the community is 23.8.
- There is a broad distribution of age levels in the community, with almost equal representation in the 16 through 24 (15.54%), 25 through 34 (15.22%), and 35 through 49 (15.82%) age categories.
- The neighborhood population under 5 years of age and over 65 years of age totals just over twenty percent (21.19%) of the population.
- Nearly ten percent (9.4%) of community residents are 65 years of age or older.
- Nearly one-third of the residents are less than sixteen years of age, with 22.7% of the total population between ages five through 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>10051</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>11.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 through 15</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 through 24</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 through 34</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 through 49</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>15.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 through 64</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnicity

- The largest ethnic group is Hispanic, comprising approximately seventy-five percent (76.88%) of the population. This compares with a city-wide average of 33.21%.
- Non-Hispanic Blacks comprise 16.47% of the population
- Together, Hispanics and Blacks make up nearly ninety-five percent (93.35%) of community residents.
- Non-Hispanic Whites comprise slightly less than five percent (4.23%) of the population.
- American Indian / Alaska Native comprise 1.37% of the population.
- Asians make up approximately one percent (1.02%) of the population.
- Over two-thirds (68.1%) aged five and over speak a language other than English. Of those who speak a language other than English, two-thirds speak English “less than well”. Just over two-thirds (67.9%) of those who speak a language other than English speak Spanish as their other language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY/RACE</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>10051</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7741</td>
<td>76.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>16.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaska Native</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Distributions do not add to 100 percent due to multiple response options*
Household Composition

- The majority of households in the community are households with two or more individuals.

- A significant number of households are single-person households. Nearly thirty percent (29.09%). This is in sharp contrast to characteristics of households across the city as a whole, where less than ten percent (9.10%) of the households are single-person households.

- The single-person households are almost evenly divided between male (15.94% of total population) and female (13.15% of total population) households.

- Family households comprise the largest segment of households. They are approximately two-thirds (66.85%) of the households, virtually paralleling the percentage of family households across the city as a whole (also two-thirds of the households).

- The neighborhood has approximately twenty percent (19.55%) of the households populated by married couples with children under the age of 18. This is slightly lower than the city-wide average of nearly twenty-five percent (24.12%).

- Nearly twenty percent (19.35%) of households have female householders with children present under the age of 18. This is nearly four times the frequency of households that have male householders with children present under the age of 18 (2.47%).

- The average household size is 3.12 and the average number of individuals in family households is 4.46.

- The frequency of disabilities is relatively high in this community. Nearly one-third (32.1%) report some form of disability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD BY TYPE</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Households</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Person Household:</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>15.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>13.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Persons Households:</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>70.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households:</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>66.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple family:</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>29.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children under 18 years</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>9.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family:</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present:</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No own children under 18 years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present:</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>30.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children under 18 years</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>11.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily Households:</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing Characteristics**

- The community contains some of the oldest housing in the city. Nearly three-quarters (74.13%) of the housing units were constructed prior to 1970, and over one-third (33.89%) of the units were constructed prior to 1950.

- In 2000, the average value of owner-occupied housing in the community was $54,749 – just over one-third of the citywide average of $146,525.

- The greatest number of housing units in the community are one-unit detached dwellings – comprising 42.85% of the total.

- An additional 16.72% of the housing units are duplexes or two-unit apartment complexes.

- Nearly forty-percent (39.73%) of the housing units are apartments or multi-family flats with three or more units.

- The remainder of units are mobile home residences, comprising about two percent (2.15%) of the units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF HOUSING UNITS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit detached</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>42.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit attached</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>17.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 49 units</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more units</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>15.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Status

- Approximately twenty-five percent (24.73%) of the housing units are owner-occupied.

- About sixty-six percent of the units (66.28%) are renter-occupied.

- The average gross rent is $325.00 per month per housing unit.

- For those that pay a mortgage, the average payment is $348.00.

- An estimated 8.9% of the housing units are vacant.

In 2004, the number of housing units requiring repair in the community were among the highest in the city. They ranged from 40-50% in the area south of Buckeye and east of 7th Avenue, to 50-60% in the area north of Buckeye and east of 7th Avenue, to 70-80% in the area south of Buckeye and west of 7th Avenue, to 80-100% in the area north of Buckeye and west of 7th Avenue (Figure 4).

Over a ten year period from 1994 through 2004, the percentage increase of homes in the community requiring repair increased by 20-40% in the area east of 7th Avenue and 40-60% in the area west of 7th Avenue (Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION OF HOUSING UNITS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>24.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>66.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Adapted from Percent of Housing Units Requiring Repair - 2004.
(Source: ftp://phoenix.gov/pub/NSD/consect2.pdf)
Figure 5. Adapted from Percent Change in Housing Units Requiring Repair – 1994 -2004.
(Source: ftp://phoenix.gov/pub/NSD/consect2.pdf)
Housing Permits

- During the period 2000 through 2008, 638 new unit residential permits were awarded.
- The majority of these permits were awarded in the community west of 7th Avenue.
- A significant number of these permits were also awarded between 7th Avenue and 3rd Street, north of Buckeye Road.
- Relatively few permits were awarded south of Buckeye Road and east of 7th Street, although there were a significant number awarded for the far southeast corner of the community.
- Most of the permits were for apartments (216 units – 33.68%) and townhomes (228 units – 33.12%). Apartment and townhome permits constituted approximately two-thirds (67.1%) of the total.

Figure 6. New Residential Permits, 2000-2008.  
(Source: City of Phoenix Planning Department)
Income

- The average household income for 2000 was $21,471, significantly less than the average household income across the city which was $49,923.

- Over one half (55.35%) of the households reported incomes of less than $25,000.

- Only about five percent (5.47%) of the neighborhood’s households reported annual income between $50,000 and $99,000, significantly less than the city-wide frequency of 28.73%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households to Determine Income</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>39.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>19.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The poverty threshold defined by the U.S. Census Bureau in 1999 for a family of four was $17,029.

- By these standards, over sixty percent (60.97%) of the population in the community was determined to be living below the poverty status at that time. Geographically, poverty is broadly distributed throughout the community (Figure 7).

- Nearly forty-five percent (44.90%) of the individuals living in poverty were under the age of 18.

- Approximately eight percent (7.92%) of those living in poverty were over sixty-four years of age.

- Approximately nine out of ten families (88.9%) living in poverty have children under the age of eighteen.
## POVERTY RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Individuals for whom Poverty Status is Determined</td>
<td>9988</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Below the Poverty Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>15.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 11 years</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 17 years</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>48.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years and over</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. Poverty Rate Mapping.**

Note: Numerical overlays refer to VSUW Funded Programs – See Appendix B, Page 39
(Source: Valley of the Sun United Way)
Employment

- The unemployment rate in the area (2000) was nineteen percent.
- For males, the most frequently reported employment category was construction. Nearly one-quarter (23.89%) of males are employed in that field.
- Other frequently reported categories by males include the arts, entertainment, accommodation, and food services industries (17.80%), and manufacturing (15.62%).
- Less than nine percent (8.55%) of males are employed in the professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services sector.
- For females, the two most frequently reported employment categories are educational, health, and human services (17.60%) and manufacturing (17.35%).
- The arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services sector was reported as an employment category by about fifteen percent (15.03%) of the women.
- The professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services category was reported by less than ten percent of the women (9.89%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYMENT CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>23.89%</td>
<td>Educational Health Social services</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Entertainment Recreation Accommodation Food services</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>15.62%</td>
<td>Arts Entertainment Recreation Accommodation Food services</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Scientific Management Administrative Waste mgmt services</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>Professional Scientific Management Administrative Waste mgmt services</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Health Social services</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>Other services (except public administration)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Warehousing Utilities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>Finance Insurance Real estate Rental/leasing</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>Public admin</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Insurance Real estate Rental/leasing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Mode of Transportation

- All of those employed in the community work within Maricopa County.
- Nearly eighty percent (78.61%) drive a car, truck, or van to their place of employment.
- Of those driving to work, 937 (61.86%) drive alone, but 636 (38.14%) of them carpooled.
- Less than ten percent (8.4%) of the residents utilize public transportation to get to their place of employment.
- Approximately six percent (5.99%) walk to work.
- Just over one percent (1.35%) of those working did so from home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years &amp; over</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van:</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>78.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove alone</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>48.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>31.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation:</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or trolley bus</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment Options within the Community

Many sectors offer employment opportunities directly within the Central City South community. Appendix B inventories these sectors, and identifies specific organizations that employ workers. A geographic mapping of these employment assets is presented in Figure 8.

- Of the 186 employers in the community with three or more employees, most are located within the eastern two-thirds of the community.

- The employer categories are quite diverse -- ranging from manufacturing, to financing, to transportation, to professional services to utilities.

- The most frequent category of employers with three or more employees is manufacturing, consisting of 27 businesses (14.51% of all employers) and 504 total employees.

- The next most frequent cluster is health care and social service organizations. Collectively, they represent 25 organizations (13.44% of all employers) and 680 employees.

- Wholesale trade businesses are also prevalent in the community, with 24 businesses (12.90% of all employers) and 530 employees represented.

Figure 8. Employers within Community, Mapped by Employment Category
(Source: City of Phoenix Planning Department)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYERS WITH THREE OR MORE EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>Number Of Employees</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Employers</td>
<td>3872</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical services</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (except public administration)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; support &amp; waste management. &amp; remediation services</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education and Schools

- Level of educational attainment for community residents is among the lowest in the city. About seventy percent (69.87%) of residents aged 25 and higher have not graduated from high school, compared to about 31 percent for the city as a whole.

- Approximately one-third (33.91%) of the residents are enrolled in some level of schooling.

- Approximately 2 percent (2.3%) of the residents are enrolled in college or a university, either at the undergraduate (2.1%) or graduate (0.2%) level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population Base</td>
<td>9379</td>
<td>4647</td>
<td>49.55%</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>50.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in nursery school, preschool</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>56.77%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65.63%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in kindergarten:</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>42.96%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>57.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>42.96%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>57.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4:</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>46.96%</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>53.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.79%</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>62.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8:</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>53.31%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>46.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>52.36%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>47.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12:</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>51.16%</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>48.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>51.51%</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>48.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in college, undergraduate years:</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in graduate or professional school:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in school</td>
<td>6199</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>49.49%</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td>50.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are five schools geographically located in the community:

- Lowell Elementary School
- Dunbar Paul Lawrence Elementary School
- Friendly House Academia del Pueblo
- Bethune Elementary School
- Tertulia: Pre College community Intermediate Campus

- The community is served by the Phoenix Union High School District, with Central High School and North High School being the anchor campuses for the community.

**Lowell Elementary School**

- Lowell Elementary, at 1131 S. 3rd Avenue, is one of 18 schools in Phoenix Elementary District. It is a public school that serves 686 students in grades Pre-kindergarten through 8.

- The school achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, signifying that it achieved the minimum levels of improvement determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

- In 2008, 93% of the students were Hispanic, 5% White, and 2% of other races and ethnicities.

- In general, state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, writing, and science achievement are below the norms on a state-wide basis.

- In lower grade levels, they tend to be lower than district-wide averages, but the scores tend to be higher than district-wide levels in the upper grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOWELL ELEMENTARY -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lowell elementary is positioned as a math, science and technology school, with a focus on integrating social sciences, reading, music, language arts, art, and physical education.

- Instructional Programs include: 90 Minute Reading Block (Harcourt Brace, Houghton Mifflin); McDougall Littell Math; Foss Science.
- The school features a courtyard that serves as a living science classroom and includes a desert and riparian pond.

- Extracurricular activities include: PEER- before and after school programs, arts & crafts, leap pad, computer instruction, organized sports, and homework assistance; Mileage Club; Valley Youth Theatre.

- Honors programs include: Arizona Educational Foundation A+ School Award, Rodel Teacher Award Winner, ADE Benchmark School Award for 8th Grade, and National Board Certified Teacher Award Winner.

- Available social services include: health clinic, dental services, food assistance, clothing assistance, counseling referrals, and breath-mobile for asthma.

**Dunbar Paul Lawrence Elementary School**

- Dunbar Paul Lawrence Elementary, at 707 West Grant Street, is another of the 18 schools in Phoenix Elementary District. It is a public school that serves 235 students in grades Pre-kindergarten through 8.

- The school achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, signifying that it achieved the minimum levels of improvement determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

- In 2008, 72% of the students were Hispanic, 21% were Black, 4% were White, 2% American Indian / Native Alaskan, and 1% of other races and ethnicities.

- In general, state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, writing, and science achievement are below the norms on a state-wide basis.

- In Grade 3, they tend to be relatively equal to or above district averages. In lower grade levels, they tend to be lower than district-wide averages, but they tend to lag significantly behind district averages in middle and upper grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUNBAR PAUL LAWRENCE ELEMENTARY -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Dunbar Paul Lawrence Elementary positions itself with a focus on reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies and science, and music.

- Special programs include: art, music, physical education, and technology.

- Extracurricular activities include: PEER- before and after school programs.

- Available social services include: school social worker, school nurse, community worker, and school psychologist.

**Friendly House Academia del Pueblo**

- Friendly House Academia Del Pueblo, at 201 East Durango, is a charter school serving 220 students in grades Kindergarten through 9.

- The school did not achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, signifying that it did not meet the minimum levels of improvement determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

- In 2008, 97% of the students were Hispanic, 2% were White, and 1% of other races and ethnicities.

- In general, state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, writing, and science achievement are below the norms on a state-wide basis.

- There is a significant lag in science scores for grade 8, when compared to state-wide scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRIENDLY HOUSE ACADEMIA DEL PUEBLO -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Friendly House Academia Del Pueblo positions itself as having a focus on academic excellence with a core curriculum plus drama, art, physical education, soccer, and computers.

- Special programs include: drama and performing arts area.

- Extracurricular activities include: soccer and physical education.
Bethune Elementary School

- Bethune Elementary School, located at 1310 S. 15th Ave., is also one of the 18 schools in Phoenix Elementary District. It is a public school that serves 743 students in grades Pre-kindergarten through 8.

- The school did not achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, signifying that it did not achieve the minimum levels of improvement determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

- In 2008, 87% of the students were Hispanic, 11% were Black, 1% were American Indian/Native Alaskan, and 1% of other races and ethnicities.

- In general, state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, writing, and science achievement are below the norms on a state-wide basis, and also below norms on a district-wide basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BERTHUNE ELEMENTARY -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Math</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 Math</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 Math</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bethune Elementary School positions itself with a focus on high achievement for every child using strategies that include integrating the arts and technology into the curriculum.

- Special programs include: music, band, physical education, special education, Bethune Video projects, McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance, and the Keep Gym in Schools Program.

- Available social services include: school social worker, school nurse, and school resource officer.

Tertulia: A Learning Community School

- Tertulia Pre-College Community School is located at 812 South 6th Ave. It is a charter school, and one of two elementary school campuses in Phoenix that comprise Tertulia: A Learning Community. It serves 167 students in grades Kindergarten through 4.
The school did not achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, signifying that it achieved the minimum levels of improvement determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

In 2008, 98% of the students were Hispanic, 1% were White, and 1% of other races and ethnicities.

In general, state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, writing, and science achievement are below the norms on a state-wide basis. However, Grade 4 math achievement is on par with state-wide averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERTULIA SCHOOL -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tertulia positions itself with a focus on instilling the student’s desire to enroll in a four-year college or university.

It offers dual-language programming, where 50% of the instruction is in English and 50% is in Spanish.

In addition to offering core standards-based academic programming, it offers an environment to foster immediate academic and disciplinary intervention as needed.

**Central High School**

Central High School serves the community with its campus at 4525 North Central Ave. It is one of 18 high schools in Phoenix Union High School District. It is a public school that serves 2369 students in grades 9 through 12.

It has an attendance rate of 97.9%, a 4-year graduation rate of 80.7%, and an annual dropout rate of 3.1%.

In 2008, 63.1% of the students were Hispanic, 12.2% were Black, 11.0% were White, 6.9% Native American, and 6.8% Asian.
- In general, state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, writing, and science achievement are below the norms on a state-wide basis, and also below norms on a district-wide basis.

- In 2009, Central High School was rated as a Performing School as determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

### CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There are in excess of 72 student clubs and groups for extracurricular activities.

### North High School

- North High School serves the community with its campus at 1101 East Thomas Road. It is one of 18 high schools in Phoenix Union High School District. It is a public school that serves 2567 students in grades 9 through 12.

- It has an attendance rate of 98.1%, a 4-year graduation rate of 71.8%, and an annual dropout rate of 3.5%.

- In 2009, 76.2% of the students were Hispanic, 8.4% were Black, 7.8% were White, 5.3% Native American, and 2.3% Asian.

- In general, 2008 state test scores for achievement (AIMS) in math, reading, and writing achievement were below the norms on a state-wide basis, but above the norms on a district-wide basis.

- In 2009, North High School was rated as a Performing School as determined by the State of Arizona in terms of student performance and other accountability measures.

### NORTH HIGH SCHOOL -- STATE (AIMS) TEST SCORES (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There are 30 student clubs and groups for extracurricular activities.
Public Safety - Police Protection

- This community is served by the South Mountain Police Precinct located at 400 W. Southern Ave - primarily beats 414 and 415 of that precinct.

- Relative to the rest of the city, and numerically speaking, the total number of reported violent crimes in 2009 is generally moderate for the portion of the community that is west of 7th Avenue, moderately low in the area from 7th Avenue to Central Avenue, and low east of Central (see Figure 9).
Figure 9. Adapted from City of Phoenix Reported Violent Crimes – 2009.
(Source: City of Phoenix Police Department)
• Most forms of crime generally had downward trend through the years 2006 through 2008. This mirrored the downward trend for many measures for the city as a whole.

• Exceptions to this downward trend included reports of sexual assault and theft. Reports of sexual assault ranged from 4 in 2006, 13 in 2007, and 7 in 2008. Reports of theft ranged from 166 in 2006 to 167 in 2007 to 177 in 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME COUNTS – SELECTED MEASURES</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homicide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>4194</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>4568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggravated Assault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>5997</td>
<td>5509</td>
<td>4568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crime Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>11240</td>
<td>11125</td>
<td>10864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burglary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>35199</td>
<td>38639</td>
<td>36712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>29785</td>
<td>31155</td>
<td>33464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Theft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>31142</td>
<td>26830</td>
<td>19404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>96350</td>
<td>96819</td>
<td>89779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>9856</td>
<td>9928</td>
<td>9145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>117446</td>
<td>117872</td>
<td>109784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Assessment for the Neighborhood Advocacy Team
Prepared for: Valley of the Sun United Way
Prepared by: ASU’s Partnership for Community Development
Neighborhood Initiative in Central City South
- While total reports of crime in the community range from moderate to low in the community, per capita statistics reveal a crime rate that is generally above average for the city for each of years 2006 through 2008.

- In general, per capita homicide rates run from double to four times that of the city.

- Per capita sexual assault rates range from near average up to three times the city-wide average.

- Robbery, aggravated assault, overall violent crime, and property crime runs approximately double that of the city-wide average, on a per capita basis.

- Per capita burglary, theft and auto rates are on par with the city-wide average.

- Arson rates run from two to four times as high as that of the city as a whole.

- Drug crimes generally run about four times the rate reported for a city-wide basis.

- On the whole, the overall reported crime rate has dropped from 121.1 reports per capita in 2006 to 81.1 reports per capita in 2008.

- At the same time, the overall per capita crime rate for the community is in excess of twenty percent (22.0%) higher than the city norm for 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME PER 10,000 POPULATION – SELECTED MEASURES</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homicide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggravated Assault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crime Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burglary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Theft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City South</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fire Protection

This area is primarily served by Fire Station 6 (FS6), located at 368 W. Apache St. FS6 is staffed with several fire safety and emergency medical personnel operating Paramedic/Engine 6. The station also contains a heavy rescue support truck that is staffed by members of the Engine Company when needed. The station is currently at 84% of capacity, according to the 2004 City of Phoenix Planning Department Central City South Area Plan.

Public Transportation

Phoenix Dial-a-Ride provides service seven days a week to seniors and persons with disabilities. Dial-A-Ride usage in this area is considered zone 4. Service hours are Monday through Friday, 5 a.m. to midnight; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. Fares: for seniors, persons with disabilities, and youths (ages 18 and under), the first zone is $2.50 and each additional zone is $1.50; for regular fares, the first zone is $5.00 and each additional zone is $3.00; ADA passengers are $3.50. Cash, regional Dial-a-Ride tickets, and ADA monthly passes are accepted.

- Bus Route 7 operates daily along 7th Street from Dobbins Road in south Phoenix to Union Hills in north Phoenix. The bus runs weekdays from 5:00 am to 11:00 pm every 30 minutes and Saturday through Sunday from 5:45 am to 8:45 pm every 30 minutes.
- Bus Route 8 operates daily along 7th Avenue from Baseline Road in south Phoenix to Dunlap in north Phoenix. The bus runs weekdays from 5:00 am to 11:00 pm every 30 minutes and Saturday through Sunday from 5:00 am to 8:30 pm every 30 minutes.
- Bus Route 10 operates daily along Lower Buckeye to Grant and then north to Camelback. The bus runs weekdays from 5:00 am to 11:00 pm every 30 minutes and Saturday through Sunday from 6:30 am to 9:30 pm every 30 minutes.
- Bus Route 13 operates daily along Buckeye from 75th Avenue in west Phoenix to 44th Street and Washington in east Phoenix. The bus runs weekdays from 5:00 am to 10:00 pm every 30 minutes and Saturday through Sunday from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm every 30 minutes.
- Bus Route 15 operates daily along 15th Avenue from Sky Harbor then along Grant Street and then to Metro Center. The bus runs weekdays from 5:00 am to 11:00 pm every 30 minutes and Saturday through Sunday from 5:00 am to 9:45 pm every 30 minutes.
- Bus Route 0 operates daily along Central Avenue from Dobbins in south Phoenix to Dunlap in north Phoenix. The bus runs weekdays from 5:00 am to 11:00 pm every 30 minutes and Saturday through Sunday from 6:00 am to 9:15 pm every 30 minutes.
- All of these public transportation routes link up to a network of routes (as well as light rail) offering good access to most portions of the metropolitan area.
Infrastructure

- Water, sanitary sewer, trash pick-up and recycling pick-up from the City of Phoenix are available throughout the community.

- Although neighborhoods in the community have adequate water and sewer service, much of this infrastructure is old and some does not meet current city standards.

- During the past decade, the city has constructed sidewalks where they did not previously exist in many of the residential areas and installed additional street lights. However, many neighborhoods still have areas where there are no sidewalks.

- There are no documented unique storm drainage issues in the community.

- The community was developed on a grid street pattern. Buckeye Road, an arterial road, runs through the center of the community. Central Avenue, 7th Street and 7th Avenue are north/south arterial streets with north connections to downtown Phoenix and south connections to the I-17 freeway that then cross the Rio Salado into South Mountain Village.

- Traffic counts indicate that none of the community’s streets exceed their functional classification.

- There are no unpaved streets in the community.

- Most neighborhoods have alleys, and alleys south of Buckeye Road are paved. Many north of Buckeye are not paved, but they are chip sealed. Many residents view alleyways as thoroughfares for crime and have expressed interest in having them abandoned and closed.
Environment

- Properties contaminated by leaking underground tanks or toxic waste from former and current industrial operations are scattered throughout and near the community, creating health and safety concerns.

- The community is impacted by over flights and jet noise from Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, located approximately two and one half miles to the east. Residents within the 1992 and 1999 contours of 65 DNL and higher (Figure 10) may be eligible for sound installation improvement grants.

- The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company owns, operates and maintains a railroad line within the 11th Avenue right-of-way. The rail line generally is operated twice daily, carrying 15 to 50 rail cars, with no weekend or evening operations.

- The I-17 freeway to the south is elevated approximately 30 feet from ground level. Only guard rails separate traffic from the embankment. As a result, freeway noise, sight of traffic, and fumes adversely affect the community. The presence of the freeway has prompted many nearby residences to be vacated and demolished, leaving vacant lots.

Figure 39. CENTRAL CITY SOUTH AREA PLAN
NOISE FROM SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT & NOISE CONTOURS

Figure 10. Noise from Sky Harbor International Airport & Noise Contours
(Source: City of Phoenix Planning Department)
Land Use and Zoning

- The majority of the community has residential zoning (R-3, R-4, and R-5). However, there are also large blocks of Commercial (C-1, C-2, C-3) and Industrial (A-1, A-2) zoning as well. A map of zoning classifications for the community is provided in Figure 10.

- Large areas of zoning for multiple family residences (R-4 and R-5) are located along and west of Central Avenue south of Buckeye Road, and also along and west of 7th Avenue. The area west of 7th Avenue and between Grant Street and Buckeye Road houses the HOPE VI Matthew Hensen Residential area.

- The commercial areas are primarily along the larger arterial streets, but there are important exceptions to accommodate businesses with the core neighborhoods as well as on the outskirts of the neighborhood, along Grant on the North and the freeway on the South.

- The industrial areas (A-1, A-2) are largely in the eastern portion of the community between Central and 7th Street. There are also pockets of industrial area zoning along the southern boundary of the community, specifically west on Central, and west of 7th Avenue.

- There are four sites for zoning reclassification change that have been approved, but not yet adopted (see Figure 10).

- All of the community west of Central Avenue is within the City of Phoenix’s Central City South Interim Overlay District (Figure 12).

- The purpose of the District is to protect and enhance residential character in the area, promote community identity, reduce open land uses, discourage undue concentration of environmentally harmful land uses, and promote well managed growth. It specifies the character of prohibited uses, special permit uses, use permit uses, industrial development standards and residential design guidelines (Section 656 of the City of Phoenix Zoning Ordinance).

- A portion of the community east of Central Avenue and along Buckeye Road is within the City of Phoenix’s East Buckeye Road Overlay District. Its purpose is to enhance the character and visual appeal of development along the Buckeye Road corridor. It provides for limitation on permitted uses, varied development standards including setbacks, landscaping, building entrances and façade treatment (section 666 of the City of Phoenix Zoning Ordinance).
CITY OF PHOENIX ZONING CLASSIFICATION CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Commercial – Neighborhood Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>Commercial – Intermediate Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Commercial – General commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Multiple Family Residence (Detached SF 5 to 6.5 or 12 w/bonus) (Attached 14.5 to 15.23 or 17.4 w/Bonus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Multiple Family Residence (Detached SF 5 to 6.5 or 12 w/bonus) (Attached 29 to 30.45 or 30.8 w/Bonus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Multiple Family Residence (Detached SF 5 to 6.5 or 12 w/bonus) (Attached 43.5 to 45.68 or 52.2 w/Bonus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Zoning Classifications for the Central City South Community - Modified to display Central City South boundaries.  
(Source: City of Phoenix Planning Department)
Figure 12. Central City South Interim Overlay District  
(Source: City of Phoenix Planning Department)

Figure 13. East Buckeye Road Overlay District  
(Source: City of Phoenix Planning Department)
Appendix B: Community Assets

Valley of the Sun United Way Poverty Rate Map (modified) and Programs by Focus Area:

FireStar Central City South

(Poverty Rate)
- < 8.0%
- 8.0 - 19.5%
- 19.6 - 34.3%
- 34.4 - 56.3%
- 56.4% +

(Agencies)
- AZ State CU
- AZ Federal CU
- Bank of America
- JP Chase
- U.S. Bank
- Wells Fargo Bank

Programs by Focus Area
- Financial Stability
- Health & Wellness
- Hunger & Homelessness
- Children & Youth
- Basic Needs

NUM AGENCY
7 Friendly House
8 Back To School Clothing Drive Assn.
11 Valley del Sol, Inc.
16 Camp Fire USA Greater Arizona Council
16 Tumbleweed Center for Youth Development
20 Central Arizona Shelter Services
33 Boys & Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Phoenix
37 Friendly House
38 Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc.
39 Boys & Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Phoenix
40 The Salvation Army
41 Banner Poison Control Center
45 Arizona Bridge to Independent Living
45 Greater Phoenix Urban League
56 Girl Scouts - Arizona Cactus-Pine Council
67 Neighborhood Ministries, Inc.
68 St. Joseph the Worker
71 Communities In Schools of Arizona
73 Community Legal Services
77 Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Arizona
79 Valley Christian Centers, Inc.
80 Greater Phoenix Youth at Risk Foundation, Inc.
85 Tumbleweed Center for Youth Development
86 Boys & Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Phoenix
103 Emmett McLoughlin Training Center
104 FIBCO Family Services, Inc.
107 Garfield Weed & Seed
116 Valley of the Sun YMCA
117 Valley Christian Centers, Inc.
120 Phoenix Birthright Project
123 Southwest Center for HIV/AIDS
124 Greater Phoenix Urban League
125 Phoenix Day Child & Family Learning Ctr

(PROGRAM)
- After School & Summer Program
- Annual Clothing Distribution July 2009
- Behavioral Health Services
- Camp Fire Camps & Clubs
- Casa de Sueños, Boys House & Open H&S
- CASS Dental Clinic
- Dave Pratt Dental Clinic
- Early Childhood Development Center
- Early Head Start Care Program
- Education & Career Development
- Emergency Assistance Program
- Emergency Poison & Drug Information Service
- Ensure Independence
- First Time Home Buyers
- Girl Scout Programs
- Jeremiah Project-Phase 2
- Job Development, Placement, & Retention
- Learning Academies
- Legal Aid for Individuals & Families in Crisis
- Mentoring
- Neighbor Development
- New Pathways/PALS Mentoring Programs
- Phoenix & Tempe Drop In Centers
- Positive Youth Development
- VITA EM Training Center
- VITA FIBCO
- VITA Garfield Weed & Seed
- Youth & Y-Kids Intervention Programs
- Youth Leadership Development
- Sister Friends: Saving Our Babies
- Prevention & Intervention Services
- Middle & High School College Prep Program
- Early Education & Child Care/ Volunteer Program

FOCUS
- Productive Youth
- Basic Needs/Quality of Life
- Health & Wellness
- Productive Youth
- Crisis to Stability
- Basic Needs/Quality of Life
- School Readiness
- Productive Youth
- Basic Needs/Quality of Life
- Health & Wellness
- Productive Youth
- Crisis to Stability
- Financial Stability
- Productive Youth
- Financial Stability
- Productive Youth
- Financial Stability
- Productive Youth
- Financial Stability
- Productive Youth
- Health & Wellness
- Productive Youth
- School Readiness

(Source: Valley of the Sun United Way)
**Educational Institutions Located in Central City South (5)**

**Academia del Pueblo**  
201 East Durango Street  
Phone: (602) 258-4353  
Principal: Ximena Doyle  
Grades: K-8  
Start Time: 8:00 am  
Dismissal: 3:50 pm

**Lowell Elementary School**  
1121 South 3rd Avenue  
Phone: (602) 257-3902  
Principal: Ms. Rosanna Hidalgo  
Grades: PreK-8  
Start Time: 8:10 am  
Dismissal: 3:10  
Wednesday Dismissal: 1:15 pm

**Mary Bethune Elementary School** (Technically New Home neighborhood)  
1310 South 15th Avenue  
Phone: (602) 257-3830  
Principal: Dr. Ronnie Pitre  
Grades: PreK-8  
Start Time: 8:40 am  
Dismissal: 3:40 pm  
Wednesday Dismissal: 1:45 pm

**Paul Lawrence Dunbar Elementary School** (Technically Matthew Henson neighborhood)  
707 West Grant Street  
Phone: (602) 257-3831  
Principal: Ms. Loraine Payton  
Grades: PreK-8  
Start Time: 8:40 am  
Dismissal: 3:40 pm  
Wednesday Dismissal: 1:45 pm

**Tertulia Pre-College Community** (Administrative Offices)  
812 South 6th Avenue  
Phone: (602) 262-2200  
Principal: Miriam Zamora  
Grades: K-4  
Start Time: 7:45 am  
Dismissal: 3:00 pm  
Friday Dismissal: Noon
Faith Communities (18)

Holy Living Christian Fellowship
1106 West Apache St
Phone: (602) 258-9243

Christian New Life Ministries
1301 East Buckeye Road
Phoenix, AZ 85034-4104
Phone: (602) 462-9962

Tonto Church of Christ
1101 West Tonto Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 258-9243

Faith Equator Mission Church
1306 South 9th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 254-3393

Faith Believing in God Ministries
1014 East Cocopah Street
Phoenix, AZ 85034
Phone: (602) 252-1990

Grace Temple Church of God
811 West Buckeye Road
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3710
Phone: (602) 258-5205

Greater New Zion Baptist Church
350 West Mohave Street
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2744
Phone: (602) 254-1688
http://gnzbc.net/

House of Prayers – God in Christ
1402 South 11th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3909
Phone: (602) 258-3274

Iglesia Bautista El Sembrador
502 West Pima Street
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2755
Phone: (602) 253-6078

New Home Baptist Church
1144 West Sherman Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3616
Phone: (602) 254-8292

Primera Iglesia United Methodist Church
701 S First Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Phone 602 254-1132

Roosevelt Community Church
924 South 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 495-3191
http://www.rooseveltcchurch.org/

Shiloh Baptist Church
901 West Buckeye Road
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3711
Phone: (602) 253-0219

St. Anthony’s Catholic Church
909 South 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2505
Phone: (602) 252-1771

St. John’s Institutional Baptist Church
1428 South 13th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007-4139
Phone: (602) 252-5344

St Paul’s Sudanese Episcopal Mission
527 West Pima Street
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2754
Phone: (602) 253-4094

Tempie Wade Church of the New World
1330 West Buckeye Road
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3719
Phone: (602) 258-1530
Medical Facilities (5)

Maricopa County Integrated Health System
Seventh Avenue Family Health Center
Seventh Avenue Dental Clinic
1201 South 7th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3917
Main: (602) 344-6600
Dental Phone: (602) 344-6609
http://www.mihs.org/

Note:
The facility does not provide hospital services to community members.

Hours: 8:00am - 5:00pm, Monday through Friday, except holidays
Clinic Manager - Veronica Ojeda
Medical Director - Kim Faulkner, MD
Specialties - Family practice
Special Services - Pharmacy services, Radiology, Laboratory
Other Services – Financial Planning

(Source: http://www.mihs.org/ourfacility/7thavenue.html)

Medical Office Building
515 West Buckeye Road
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Description:
The office building includes a range of providers offering varied medical services.

- OneCare Family Center Providers

(Source: http://www.care1st.com/az/PDF/ONECare/provider/directory/2010/ONECare-Provider-Pharmacy-Directory.pdf)

- P. S. Medical Group

(Source: http://www.azdhs.gov/hsd/sfsclinics.htm)

- Laboratory Corporation of America which provides leading-edge medical laboratory tests and services through a national network of primary clinical laboratories and specialized Centers of Excellence.

(Source: https://www.labcorp.com/wps/portal/lut/p/c0/04_SB8K8xLLM9M5SSzPy8xBz9CP0os_hACzO_QCM_IwMLo1ALAyNj1yBnQxNfAwMDY_2CbEdFANq6iRA/)
Promise Hospital of Phoenix
1201 South 7th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3917
Phone: (602) 716-500

Note:
The clinic is housed within Maricopa County Integrated Health System Complex and does not provide hospital services to community members.

Description:
Long term acute care for patients with complex medical conditions.

Chief Executive Officer - Kevin Nicholson, knicholson@promisehealthcare.com
Chief Clinical Officer - Wendy Larson, wlarson@promisehealthcare.com
Director, Physician Relations & Education - Amber Day, aday@promisehealthcare.com

Programs:
• Cardiopulmonary Program
• Advanced Wound Care Program

Clinical services and programs:
• 24-hour Intensive Care Unit (ICU)
• Cardiac Monitoring
• Hemodynamic Monitoring
• Titrate Pressure Support Medication
• Ventilator Weaning
• Dialysis Services
• 24/7 Respiratory Therapy and Care
• IV Antibiotic Therapy
• Total Parenteral Nutrition – TPN
• Comprehensive Wound Care
• Pain Management
• Negative Pressure Ventilation Rooms
• Wound Vacuum Assisted Closure (VAC) Therapy (KCI Products)
• Physical Therapy
• Occupational Therapy
• Speech Therapy
• Nutritional Services
• Diabetes Management
• Pharmacy Services
• Radiology, CT, MRI (Contract Services)
• Laboratory Services (Contract Services)
• Patient Advocacy
- Chaplaincy
- Med-Psych Program


South Phoenix Fresenius Medical Care Dialysis
1021 South 7th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: 1 (866) 434-2597

Provides ongoing dialysis treatment for more than 127,539 patients through our network of more than 1,700 facilities nationwide, making us the largest provider of such renal services in North America. More than 35,000 employees share a commitment to deliver the highest quality care.

(Source: https://www.ultracare-dialysis.com/engine/renderpage.asp?pid=s0133)

Southwest Behavioral Health
1424 South 7th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3902
Phone: (602) 258-3600
http://www.sbhservices.org/

This is an outpatient services location which provides:

**General Mental Health Counseling:**
Outpatient individual and group counseling services are available for a variety of behavioral health problems experienced by children, adults and families. These services are designed to assist with daily living stressors such as relationships, divorce, grief and loss, loneliness, anxiety and depression, sexual victimization, parenting, school and career adjustment difficulties, hyperactivity, and others.

**Substance Abuse Programs:**
Southwest Behavioral Health Services’ substance abuse programs focus on outpatient care for alcohol and drug abusers and their families through individual, group and family therapy.

**Services include:**
- Counseling through group, family, and individual formats.
- Direct Support/Skills Training for individuals and groups.
- Case Management to assist with accessing community resources.
- Home-Based Counseling is provided for eligible families who live in our service area.
- Group Counseling is provided for people with similar types of problems.
- Psychiatric Care through psychiatric evaluations and medication monitoring.

(Source: http://www.sbhservices.org/index.php?page=services#Outpatient)
Community-Based Groups and Committees (2)

Central City Village Planning Committee
City of Phoenix Planning Department

Contact:
Katherine Coles
Central City Village Planner
Planning Department
Phone: (602) 256-5648
Email: katherine.coles@phoenix.gov

The CCS community is a portion of the larger Central City Village of the City of Phoenix (see Figure II at the end of this Appendix). The Central City Village Planning Committee serves as a link between the community and city decision-makers. The Committee reviews and comments on General plan amendments, zoning ordinance text amendments, rezoning requests and planning initiatives.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/planning/vpcentrl.html)

Community for All Ages
Arizona Community Foundation

Contact:
Eva A. Olivas
Program Director
Phone: (602) 253-6895
Email: evaolivas@phxrevitalization.org

Description:
The goal of our Communities for All Ages coalition is to build strong relationships between residents, businesses, providers and government entities that will result in unified efforts to create policies, practices, and public places that support and benefit our community. Our coalition’s goal is to improve the quality of life for those who work, play and live in Central City South through resident driven processes.

Initiative Funders:
Arizona Community Foundation

Team:
Phoenix Revitalization Corporation
City of Phoenix HOPE VI
City of Phoenix- Parks & Recreation
City of Phoenix - Community Initiatives
Valley Christian Centers
Association for Supportive Childcare
Girl Scouts - Arizona Cactus Pine Council
Marcos De Niza Tenant Council
Arizona Public Service
Harmon Library
Maricopa Skills Center
Community Food Connection

(Source: http://communitiesforallages.org/central-city/our-initiative)
Neighborhood Associations & Block Watch Groups (8 Officially Registered)

It should be noted that the neighborhood from Central Avenue to 7th Street and Grant Street to Interstate 17 has in recent years fallen under the umbrella of the Grant Park Neighborhood Association. In 2010, a group emerged that wishes to form an association for the neighborhood.

Primary Contact:
Lyle Plocher
Phone: (602) 373 3725
Email: lyleplocher@gmail.com

The following groups were officially registered at: http://phoenix.gov/phxd/NSDAssoc/search-alpha-init.do

Alkire/Bethune Community Merchants Association

Boundary Description:
North: West Buchanan Street
South: University Drive (The Salt River)
West: South 19th Avenue
East: South 7th Avenue

Organization Goals:
To improve police service and crime prevention, enhance economic development and contribute to the overall welfare of the neighborhood youth.

Primary Contact:
Mr. Elisha Elesha
Merchant
1701 S. 15th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Day: (602) 257-9249

Downtown Southwest Neighborhood Association

Boundary Description:
North: Grant Street
South: I 17 Freeway
West: 19th Ave
East: 7th Ave

Organization Goals:
Our objective is to clean and beautify the blighted, predominately low income, minority neighborhood.
Primary Contact:
Mr. Marvin Martin
Project Manager
730 S. 15th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Day: (602) 252-1144

Grant Park Neighborhood Coalition

Boundary Description:
North: Lincoln Street
South: Buckeye Road
West: 7th Avenue
East: Central Avenue

Organization Goals:
To bring resources and revitalize and organize the neighborhood.

Primary Contact:
Mr. Julian Sodari
821 S. Montezuma Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Day: (602) 253-7326
Alt: (602) 410-1882

Grant Park Neighborhood Fightback Association

Boundary Description:
North: Lincoln Street
South: Buckeye Road
West: 7th Avenue
East: Central Avenue

Organization Goals:
To improve the quality of life in the Grant Park neighborhood.

Primary Contact:
Formerly, the late Judge Armando Gandarilla.

Greater Hope/Esperanza Grande Block Watch

Boundary Description:
North: I 10 Freeway
South: Buckeye Road
West: 7th Street
East: Central Avenue
Organization Goals:
To help stop soliciting, loitering, graffiti, break-ins, rape, robbery, trafficking and drug houses.

Primary Contact:
Mr. Larry D. Steward Sr.
President/Pastor
401 E. Mohave St.
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Day: (623) 330-3426
Alt: (602) 462-1010
Fax: (602) 262-5333

IG Homes Neighborhood Association

Boundary Description:
North: Grant Street
South: Buckeye Road
West: 19th Avenue
East: 7th Avenue

Organization Goals:
To reduce crime and blight in an effort to improve the quality of life.

Primary Contact:
Ms. Martina Rondan
Day: (602) 253-9529

Marcos De Niza Community Block Watch

Boundary Description:
North: BUCKEYE RD
South: I-17
West: 7TH AVE
East: CENTRAL

Organization Goals:
To create a safer neighborhood.

Primary Contact:
Ms. Grace Salinas
President
128 W. Mohave St.
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Day: (602) 463-8130
Alt: (602) 410-1715
Fax: (602) 534-189
West Buckeye Road Unified Neighborhood Association

**Boundary Description:**
North: Buchannan Street
South: Maricopa Freeway
West: 19th Avenue
East: 7th Avenue

**Organization Goals:**
To create a drug-free community, provide gang prevention, peer counselors, senior activities and events, and other activities to promote social welfare, civic betterments and physical improvement within the organization’s boundaries.

**Primary Contact:**
Mr. Hildellred
Vice President
1648 S. 15th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Day: (602) 795-4345
Parks (6)

Unless otherwise noted, the following information was acquired from the following sources:

- http://phoenix.gov/PARKS/parks.html#C
- http://phoenix.gov/PARKS/commcntr.html#V

Central Park
121 East Tonto Street
Phone: (602) 262-6111 & (602) 262-6798
Fax: (602) 495-5557

Description:
Playground, recreation center, restrooms, lighted basketball court; open turf, lighted multi-purpose fields, lighted softball field, volleyball court. Open from 5:30 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.

Functions:
Class / Meeting

Features:
Basketball Court
Lights
Picnic Area
Recreation Building
Restroom
Spray Pad
Volleyball Court

Central Park Recreation Center:
Currently closed. 6,000 sq. ft recreation center with porch, playground and a lighted outdoor basketball court with a multipurpose field. The area programs for youth/teen and family activities.

Grant Park
701 South 3rd Avenue
Phone: (602) 262-6412 & (602) 262-6758
Fax: (602) 495-5557

Description:
Basketball, gymnasium, picnic area, lighted playfield, playground, pool, recreation building, grill, multi-purpose field. Open from 5:30 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. Winter hours: Monday - Friday 4-8 p.m. Closed Saturday & Sunday.

Functions:
Picnic/Gathering
Boxing:
Grant Park Boxing Club. West Sherman Street, between 2nd & 3rd Avenue. Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox and her husband, Earl, dedicated the Grant Park Boxing Club so neighborhood kids can box for free. (Source: http://www.maricopa.gov/dist5/biography.aspx)

Grant Recreation Center:
Currently closed. Recreation/teen Center that primarily focuses on youth and teen activities as well as community special events. Grant houses a gymnasium, weight room, as well as multi-purpose field.

Harmon Park
1239 South 5th Avenue
Phone: (602) 262-6111 & (602) 262-6898

Note:
Currently closed.

Description:
Lighted baseball, lighted basketball, gymnasium, picnic area, playground, pool, racquetball, recreation building, shuffleboard, lighted soccer, lighted softball, lighted tennis, lighted volleyball, grill, Ramada, restrooms, playground with shade structure, water spray areas. Open from 5:30 a.m. – 11:00 p.m. Winter hours: Monday - Friday 4-8 p.m. Saturday: 8 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. Closed Sunday.

Functions:
Picnic/Gathering

Harmon Recreation Center:
Recreation/Teen Center that primarily focuses on youth and teen activities as well as community special events. Harmon houses a gymnasium, multi-purpose room, kitchen, and weight room. Non Summer Hours: Monday - Friday 4 p.m. - 7 p.m. Saturday: 8 a.m. - 1 p.m. Closed Sunday. Summer Hours (effective June through July): Monday - Friday 11:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. and 5 p.m. - 7 p.m. Saturday: 8 a.m. -1 p.m. Closed Sundays.

Matthew Henson Park
803 West Tonto Street
Phone: (602) 262-6412

Description:
Basketball, playground and playground structure, ramada.

Ninos Mini Park
1146 West Hadley Street
Phone: (602) 262-6412

Description:
Basketball. Open from 5:30 a.m. – 10 p.m.
Vernell Coleman Youth Center (HOPE VI)
1003 South 9th Avenue
Phone: (602) 262-7803 & (602) 495-7803 & (602) 495-5830

Description:
Recreation/Teen Center that primarily focuses on youth and teen activities as well as community special events. Vernell Coleman houses a drop in game room, performance/meeting room, kitchen, and computer lab as well as a lit basketball court. Non Summer Hours: Monday - Friday 4 p.m. - 7 p.m., Saturday 10 a.m. - 3 p.m., Closed Sunday. Summer Hours (effective June through July) Monday - Friday 11 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Saturdays 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Closed Sundays. Winter hours begin August 18: Monday through Friday 4-8 p.m.; 10 a.m.-4 p.m. Saturday. Closed Sunday.
Housing (6)

Multi-Family:

City of Phoenix HOPE VI/Henson Village Senior Housing (129 Units) and Between 7th and 15th Avenues, Grant and Pima Streets

City of Phoenix HOPE VI/Henson Village Family Housing (334 Units) Between 7th and 15th Avenues, Grant and Pima Streets

Grand Park Apartments
331 W Grant St
Phone: (602) 252-4167

Marcos De Niza Public Housing (374 units)
305 West Pima Street
Phone: (602) 262-6966

Memorial Towers: Senior Housing Community Living (153 Units)
1405 S 7th Ave
Phone: (602) 253-0367

West Pima Villas (3 units - for rent)
Senior Centers (2):

City of Phoenix - Marcos De Niza Senior Center
305 West Pima Street
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2752
(602) 262-7249

Description:
374 Units. Hours, 8 a.m. - 5 p.m, Monday – Friday.

Programs/Services:
- Activities - clubs and classes, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, social activities, entertainment, special events, monthly shopping trips, games, fitness classes and programs, weekly continental breakfast, daily lunch, health and education, health screenings, food programs.
- Advocacy - PACE program staff are on site and available for appointments to identify areas of needs and assist with community resources.
- Transportation - Center staff can help with registration for Reserve-A-Ride or information on other area transportation.
- Home delivered meals - This program offers delivery of meals for homebound frail, elderly and disabled clients under certain qualifications and by referral only.
- Volunteer - Volunteer opportunities at the center include assisting with meal programs, clerical tasks, host/hostess, activities and classes/workshops.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/residents/seniors/seniorcenters/marcosdeniza/index.html)

City of Phoenix Government - Senior Opportunities West
City of Phoenix Seniors Opportunity West (SOW)
1220 South 7th Ave, Phoenix
Phone: (602) 262-6610

Programs/Services:
- Activities - clubs and classes, social activities and entertainment, shopping trips, field trips, special events, games, fitness classes, weekly continental breakfast, daily lunch, health and education, health screenings, food programs.
- Advocacy and Assistance - PACE program staff are on site and available for appointments to identify areas of needs and assist with community resources.
- Transportation - Center staff can help with registration for Reserve-A-Ride or information on other area transportation.
- Home-delivered meals - This program offers delivery of meals for homebound frail, elderly and disabled clients under certain qualifications and by referral only.
- Volunteer - Volunteer opportunities at the center include assisting with meal programs, clerical tasks, host/hostess, activities and classes/workshops.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/residents/seniors/seniorcenters/sow/index.html)
Historic Properties & Eligible Properties (25)

### Downtown Phoenix Area Historic Properties

7th Avenue to 7th Street, Grant Street to Buckeye Road

| Figure 14. Downtown Phoenix Area Historic Properties - Modified to display Central City South area only. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Yaun Ah Gim Groceries (&amp; Concrete Block Rowhouse)</td>
<td>1002 S. 4th Ave.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Phoenix Linen Supply Company / Bentley Projects</td>
<td>215 E. Grant</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Vernacular Residence / House</td>
<td>818 S. 1st Ave. 818 S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Duppa-Montgomery Adobe</td>
<td>116 W. Sherman / 715 N. 2nd Ave.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Carver (George Washington) High School</td>
<td>415 E. Grant</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Adams (W.E.) House</td>
<td>1014 S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Larson (C.A.) House</td>
<td>710 S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Sharp (M.J.) House</td>
<td>1010 (1012) S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Adobe Rowhouse</td>
<td>515 W. Hadley</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Grant Park Historic District</td>
<td>Bounded by Grant, Buckeye, Central &amp; 3rd Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>General Sales Co. Wholesale Grocery Warehouse</td>
<td>515 E. Grant</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Grant Park</td>
<td>701 S. 3rd Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Karlson Machine Works</td>
<td>605 E. Grant</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>St. Monica's Church, Community Center &amp; Maternity Clinic</td>
<td>801 S. 7th Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Patterson (William H.) Elks Lodge #477</td>
<td>1007 S. 7th Ave.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>Lugo (Luis) Bakery</td>
<td>415-417 W. Sherman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>St. Anthony's Church</td>
<td>909 S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Sharp (W.C.) House</td>
<td>1009 S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Friendly House</td>
<td>802 S. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>El Portal Restaurant</td>
<td>701 S. 2nd Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>American Legion Tony Soza Post 41</td>
<td>715 S. 2nd Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Primera Iglesia Metodista Unida</td>
<td>701 S. 1st St.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Vernacular Adobe Residences</td>
<td>1011-1015 S. 6th Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Vernacular Adobe Residence</td>
<td>1024 S. 5th Ave.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Arizona Building Company Houses</td>
<td>Sherman / Hadley / 3rd Ave. / Montezuma</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* National Register listing is for five smaller, separate districts.

**Phoenix Neighborhood Development Collaborative (PNDC)**

The Phoenix Neighborhood Development Collaborative (PNDC) is a collaboration of private foundations, local corporations and government agencies who share a common purpose of improving economic and social conditions in Phoenix’s low income neighborhoods. This group of partners have come together to coordinate their investment strategies so that the collective impact of their activity will be greater than sum of the parts. Direct investors in the PNDC are:

- Arizona Community Foundation
- JP Morgan Chase Bank
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
- St. Luke’s Health Initiative
- The Lodestar Foundation
- Valley of the Sun United Way

Other collaborators include:
- City of Phoenix

**PNDC Vision:**
Neighborhoods are economically and socially vibrant, clean, safe and inviting places for families to live, work and play.

**PNDC Mission:**
Support the will and the work of residents to create socially, culturally and economically diverse neighborhoods by organizing and directing resources, providing technical assistance and fostering collaboration.

**PNDC Primary Goals:**
Increase the impact of community development on neighborhoods by:
- Directing investment of resources to “neighborhood-driven” strategies for comprehensive transformation
- Ensuring strong resident and neighborhood involvement in the development and implementation of revitalization strategies

**Lead Community Agency:**
- Phoenix Revitalization Corporation

(Source: [http://www.lisc.org/phoenix/programs/place-making_10526/collaborative_10544.shtml](http://www.lisc.org/phoenix/programs/place-making_10526/collaborative_10544.shtml))
Non-Profit & Social Service Organizations (11)

Boys and Girls Club -- I. G. Homes Branch
(Adjacent to Central City South)
1601 West Sherman Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3303
Phone: (602) 254-5814 & 602 268 3486

Programs/Services:
The Boys & Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Phoenix focuses on five core program areas that help youth develop a positive self identity, educational competencies and the values enabling them to develop positive relationships with others. Youth with these capacities can become responsible citizens and leaders who make meaningful contributions and live successful lives.

- The Arts
- Character and Leadership
- Education and Career Development
- Health and Life Skills
- Sports, Fitness and Recreation
- Dave Pratt Dental Clinic
- Outreach Services
- Summer Programs

(Source: http://www.bgcmp.org/programs.htm)

Friendly House Main Office
802 South 1st Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 257-1870

Friendly House Youth Services
201 E. Durango, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 416-7328

Friendly House Academia Del Pueblo Charter School
201 E. Durango, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 258-4353

Friendly House Immigration Services
723 South 1st Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85004
Phone: (602) 257-1870

Programs/Services:
- Adult Education
- Workforce Development
- Family Services / Counseling
- Home Care
- Immigration Services
- Academia Del Pueblo
• Youth Services
• Early Childhood
• TriO Program

(Source: http://www.friendlyhouse.org/programs.php)

Phoenix Day Learning Center
115 E Tonto St., Phoenix
Phone: (602) 254-4770

Programs/Services:
• Early Education Program is open from 6:30 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday and serves children from 6 weeks of age to 5 years.
• Bilingual Case Management Program provides on-site support services and referral to community services.
• Health Links Program provides access to free or low cost child and adult health insurance, community outreach and coordination of wellness programs.
• Food and Nutrition Program that helps to meet the daily needs of our enrolled children through the delivery of over 70,000 nutritious meals annually. Phoenix Day also serves as a community distribution center for food boxes to eligible children and the elderly.
• Community Volunteer Program recruits, retains and recognizes individuals, corporations and community groups who give Phoenix day the gift of their time and talents to enrich the lives of our children and community.

(Source: http://www.phoenixday.org/Editor/assets/pdfs/facts.pdf)

Phoenix Revitalization Corporation
1310 W Hadley St # B, Phoenix
Phone: (602) 253-6895

• Community development - newsletter, Communities for All Ages, community action team, community gardens, leadership academy
• Housing development resources - affordable housing list - a list of all the affordable housing rentals in Arizona., income limits - list of income limits for each Arizona county., property owners manual - all 9 chapters you need for your property, forms - all the forms you need for your property reporting.
• Referrals - home ownership preparation, individual development accounts, financial education classes, home buyer education classes, down payment assistance, Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA), affordable housing compliance, home ownership preparation, owner occupied re-habilitation programs, emergency home repair programs, new construction of workforce housing, acquisition, re-habilitation and sale of affordable housing.

(Source: http://www.phxrevitalization.org/programs.htm)
Salvation Army
24 East Mohave Street
Phone: (602) 388-1419 & (602) 256-4535

**Description:**
- Adult Rehabilitation Centers - Drop Box
- Adult Rehabilitation Centers - Salvation Army Family Store

*(Source: http://www.salvationarmyusa.org/ndos/app/zipcode.jsf?OpenForm&go=1&zip=85004)*

Salvation Army: Adult Rehabilitation Center
1625 South Central Avenue
(602) 256-4500
Phone: (602) 256-4500
Contact: Captain James D. Boyd

**Description:**
- Adult Program Services - Rehabilitation
- Adult Rehabilitation Centers - Adult Rehabilitation Center

*(Source: http://www.salvationarmyusa.org/ndos/app/zipcode.jsf?OpenForm&go=1&zip=85004)*

Valle del Sol
1021 South 7th Avenue
Phone: (602) 258-6797

**Description:**
Valle del Sol has grown to be one of Arizona's largest non-profit, community-based organizations helping men, women, children, families and the elderly each year through counseling, substance treatment, support services and leadership development programs.
- Adult Services
- Youth & Family Services
- Prevention
- Tiempo de Oro VARS
- Community Resource Centers
- VARS/CNRP
- Community Resources

Valley Christian Center
1326 West Hadley Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3612
Phone: (602) 258-5163

Description:
Valley Christian Center offers after school programs, food box programs and other services.

(Source: http://www.phxrevitalization.org/presentations/CCS_At_A_Glace.pdf)

Valley Christian Centers, Inc. (VCC), is a private, non-profit, Christian Faith Based, Family Life Center, whose purpose is "Fulfilling the Needs of Our Community" through economic, educational, physical and spiritual programming and assistance.

(Source: http://www.azcrc.com/resources/)

Wesley Community Center
(Adjacent to Central City South)
1300 S. 10th St.
Phoenix, AZ 85034
Day: (602) 252-5609
Contact: Betty Mathis
Web: http://www.wesleycenterphx.org/

Organization Goals:
To provide various services, programs for south-central Phoenix residents. Boundary description: North: Van Buren, South: Salt River, West: Central Ave, East: 16th St.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/phxd/NSDAssoc/search-alpha-init.do)

Greater Phoenix Urban League
1402 South 7th Avenue
Phone: (602) 254-5611

Programs/Services:
- Education Services
- Head Start
- College Prep Program
- Job Readiness Training Program
- Summer Youth Employment Program
- Housing Services
- Affordable Low Income Apartments
- First Time Homebuyers Seminar
- Foreclosure Prevention Counseling

(Source: http://www.gphxul.org, “Services Section”)
WIC Center
1260 South 7th Avenue
Phone: (602) 252-3988

**Note:** This center does not provide food, but is an administrative office for WIC.

(*Source: http://www.pimahealth.org/commhealth/PDFs/WIC-Fact-Sheet.pdf*)
Head Start Programs (4)

This information was acquired from the following source:
- http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/HeadStartOffices#map-home

Lowell (AM-1)/(AM-2)
1121 S 3rd Ave
Phoenix, AZ, 85003-2614

Head Start Program:
Greater Phoenix Urban League
1817 North 7th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2133
Phone: (620) 276-9305

Chicanos Por La Causa Inc./Early Head Start
1402 S. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ, 85004

Early Head Start Program:
CPLC Early Head Start
1242 E. Washington St.
Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85034-1171
Phone: (602) 307-5818-26

Friendly House AM
201 E Durango St
Phoenix, AZ, 85004

Head Start Program:
City of Phoenix Head Start Program
200 West Washington Street, 19th Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1611
Phone: (602) 262-4040

Bethune AM-1, AM-2
1310 South 15th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ, 85007-3826

Head Start Program:
Greater Phoenix Urban League
1817 North 7th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2133
Phone: (620) 276-9305
Government (9)

Note: Government health services, senior housing, recreation centers and parks are listed in other sections.

Central Phoenix Family Services Center
1250 South Seventh Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Note: The center is currently offering limited programs and not operating with a full administrative staff.

Description: The Central Phoenix Family Services Center operates in partnership with public and private agencies to provide a comprehensive array of onsite services to meet the emergency needs of low-income Phoenix residents.

Client Services Programs:
• Case Management is provided to help adult individuals and families resolve social service problems and assist them to achieve self-sufficiency.
• Examples of assistance provided include: budgeting, education and job training referrals, social and life-skills development, client advocacy, technical assistance, resource development, counseling and direct services to become self-sufficient/self-supporting.
• Services may include information and referral, emergency financial assistance for eligible clients experiencing a crisis with utilities and rent. Emergency food boxes and bus tickets are available for qualifying individuals.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/citzasst/famcentr.html)

Fire Station 6
368 West Apache Street
Phone: (602) 262-6306

Apparatus:
Paramedic/Engine-6

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/FIRE/stations.html)

Description
It is staffed with six firefighters that operate a paramedic engine company and a Basic Life Support (BLS) ambulance. The station also contains a heavy rescue support truck that is staffed by members of the Engine Company when needed. The station is currently at 84% of capacity.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/planning/ccsplan.pdf)

Harmon Library
1325 South 5th Avenue
Phone: (602) 262-6362
Description:
Hours: Tuesday – Thursday, 11 am to 7 pm, Friday – Saturday, 9 am to 5 pm, Sunday and Monday, closed. Size 12,400 square feet. Staff, 11.1 full time. Items in collection, 24,824. The facility offers a children's storyroom and First Five Years/Los Primeros Cinco Años interactive learning space for families with young children, a multi-purpose meeting room with a capacity of 60 for community gatherings as well as library programs, patio spaces, a special "teens only" area with materials just for teens, study rooms, WiFi and 34 Internet-accessible public computers.

(Source: http://www.phoenixpubliclibrary.org/branchinfo.jsp?bid=BHA)

Human Services Department – City of Phoenix
200 West Washington St., 18th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-1611
Phone: (602) 262-6668
General Information: (602) 262-6666

Divisions:
- Community Services Division
- Education/Head Start Division
- Senior Services Division
- Volunteer Programs and Opportunities

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/HUMANSERVICES/hsdpa09.pdf)

Matthew Henson HOPE VI Project
7th & 15th Avenues, Grant & Pima Streets

Description:
The Matthew Henson HOPE VI Project, is a federally-funded grant project that rebuilt the outdated Matthew Henson Homes. The public housing community, which was initially constructed in 1941, is located in the HOPE VI Special Redevelopment Area, between 7th and 15th avenues, Grant and Pima streets within the Central City South community, a part of City Council District 8. The project began in 2001 with an initial $35 million federal HOPE VI grant provided through HUD and has now exceeded $110 million, thanks to public, private and non-profit financial and in-kind support from various partners involved in the revitalization effort. The Matthew Henson HOPE VI Project is the first HOPE VI Project within Maricopa County to provide Homeownership Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE) through the federal grant program. The city of Phoenix has received a second HOPE VI Project grant to rebuild the Krohn West Apartment community located at 16th Avenue and Maricopa Street.

The primary goal of the HOPE VI Project is to revitalize neighborhoods by creating a mixed-income community, helping residents move toward self-sufficiency through job training and placement services and creating long-term investments in the community.
The Master Developer for the Matthew Henson HOPE VI project is McCormack, Baron, Salazar, Inc. which has overseen the development process since 2002 and McCormack, Baron, Ragan facilitates the leasing process.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/HOPEVI/)

Marcos De Niza PAL Center
301 West Pima Street
Phone: (602) 534-5040

Description:
Center is a Phoenix Activity City (PAC) site listed under youth development division.

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/PAC/pac01.html)

MV Transportation (Phoenix Sunday Dial A Ride)
1001 South 4th Street
Phone: (602) 253-4000 & (602) 462-5741

Description:
Phoenix Dial-a-Ride provides service seven days a week to seniors and persons with disabilities. Dial-A-Ride usage in this area is considered zone 4. Service hours are Monday through Friday, 5 a.m. to midnight; Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. Fares: for seniors, persons with disabilities, and youths (ages 18 and under), the first zone is $2.50 and each additional zone is $1.50; for regular fares, the first zone is $5.00 and each additional zone is $3.00; ADA passengers are $3.50. Cash, regional Dial-a-Ride tickets, and ADA monthly passes are accepted.

Neighborhood Services Department – City of Phoenix
200 West Washington Street, 4th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-1611
Phone: (602) 262-7344 or (602) 262-7344

Divisions:
• Administrative Services Division
• Community Development Division
• Neighborhood Coordination Division
• Neighborhood Preservation Division
• Neighborhood Revitalization Division

(Source: http://phoenix.gov/NSD/organization.html)
South Mountain Police Precinct
400 West Southern Avenue
Phone: (602) 495-5004

- Community Action Officers Contact
- Crime Free Multi-Housing
- Phoenix Neighborhood Patrol
- Block Watch
- Crime Prevention Education
- Station Tours
- G.A.I.N., Getting Arizona Involved in Neighborhoods
- Pipeline Newsletter

Note: Satellite offices are not listed as assets. These offices are unmanned at times and do not provide services to residents. Residents should call 911 for assistance.

(Source: http://www.phoenix.gov/police/central_city_monthly.pdf)
Other Assets (8)

Organizations:
American Legion Tony Soza Post 41
715 South 2nd Avenue
Phone: (602) 262-9243

American Veterans Memorial Post 65
1303 West Grant Street
Phone: (602) 257-9016

Arizona State NAACP
1250 South 7th Avenue
Phone: (602) 252-2931

Rosie's House A Music Academy
527 West Pima Street
Phone: (602) 252-8475

William Patterson Elks Lodge
1007 South 7th Avenue
Phone: (602) 254-1772

Museum/Cultural:
Bentley Projects
215 East Grant Street
Phone: (602) 340-9200

George Washington Carver Museum & Cultural Center
415 East Grant Street
Phone: (602) 254-7516

Shopping Center:
Progress Plaza
1202–1224 South 7th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Businesses

_Auction House_.......................... AZ Auctioneers, 1802 South 1st Avenue, 602-258-6981

Auto Body Shop.......................... Buddy's auto Workshope, 1724 South 1st Avenue, 602-256-9340
Auto Body Shop.......................... Enviro-Stripping, 204 West Maricopa Fwy, 602-258-5583
Auto Body Shop.......................... John's Auto Body & Custom Paint Shop, 1133 W. Grant St, 602-253-0770
Auto Body Shop.......................... Miranda's Customs, 706 South Central Avenue, 602-712-1783

Auto Dealership – RV ..................... Carson Trailers, 1242 South 7th Street, 602-258-2876

Auto Electric Repair...................... El Plateado, 115 East Mohave Street, 602-633-1388

Auto Glass............................... Azteca Glass, 1138 West Grant Street, 602-252-7597
Auto Glass............................... Interstate Glass, 1137 West Grant Street, 602-252-2700
Auto Glass............................... Sierra Glass, 1141 West Grant Street, 602-258-5000

Auto Parts............................... Napa Auto Parts, 502 East Buckeye Road, 602-254-6643

Auto Repair.............................. All Cash Auto Repair, 907 South 7th Avenue, 602-340-9610
Auto Repair.............................. Mikes Place, 112 West Maricopa Fwy, 602-253-1136
Auto Repair.............................. VMGT Co, 156 East Mohave Street, 602-253-2400

Auto Tire Shop ......................... Copper State Tire, 125 East Durango Street, 602-250-8650
Auto Tire Shop ......................... Perez Tire Shop, 604 East Buckeye Road, 602-254-2099
Auto Tire Shop ......................... Price Rite Tire & Auto Center, 825 South 7th Street, 602-307-9969
Auto Tire Shop ......................... Tire Works Co, 1500 South Central Avenue, 602-252-5731

Auto Truck Accessories ................. Axle Transmission, 1401 South Central Avenue, 602-254-6444

Butcher Shop............................. Meat Shop, 202 East Buckeye Road, 602-258-5075

Child Care............................... Phoenix Day Child & Family, 115 East Tonto Street, 602-252-4911

Construction........................... WD Drywall LLC Contractors, 501 West Apache Street, 602-214-0192
Construction – Linings .................. Advanced Lining Solutions, 1903 South 11th Avenue, 602-716-5552

Contractor............................... Ruben Canez Masonry, 1317 West Grant Avenue, 602-253-5303
Contractor – General................... BTC Construction, 324 East Pima Street, 602-253-0288
Contractor - Lawn Sprinkler Systems.. Universal Fog, 1808 South 1st Avenue, 602-254-9114
Contractor – Mechanical ............... Summa Mechanical, 1020 South 5th Street, 602-254-2165

Convenience Store....................... Circle K, 10 East Buckeye Road, 602-253-2937
Convenience Store....................... Circle K, 699 East Buckeye Road, 602-252-7850

Financial............................... All Out Bail Bonds, 139 West Mohave Street, 602-253-2468
Financial............................... Desert Schools Federal Credit Union, 185 W. Apache St., 602-433-7000
Financial............................... Wells Fargo ATM, 701 South Central Avenue, 602-528-7544

Grinding Service......................... Sun Grinding LLC, 522 East Buckeye Road, 602-238-9595

Grocery Delivery & Storage ............ A & G Delivery and Warehouse, 236 East Pima Street, 602-277-4747
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>Lee’s Market</td>
<td>420 West Buckeye Road, 602-254-7429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>Mary Lou’s Market</td>
<td>302 West Mohave Street, 602-253-2459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>Yee Ben</td>
<td>1101 West Grant Street, 602-253-6649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Equipment Rental</td>
<td>Road Machinery</td>
<td>716 South 7th Street, 602-252-7121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Machine Shop</td>
<td>Western Automatic Machining</td>
<td>1304 West Grant Street, 602-254-7035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Material Handling Equipment</td>
<td>Miner Southwest</td>
<td>2848 N Omaha Street, 602-426-1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Wheels &amp; Other Equipment</td>
<td>World Wheel Inc.</td>
<td>1202 South Central Avenue, 602-254-0380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundromat</td>
<td>3rd Avenue Laundry</td>
<td>1023 South 3rd Avenue, 602-616-5502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Store</td>
<td>Queen Liquors</td>
<td>724 South Central Avenue, 602-253-8364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>E Z 8 Motel</td>
<td>1820 South 7th Street, 602-254-9787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer - Clay Products</td>
<td>Phoenix Brickyard</td>
<td>1814 South 7th Avenue, 602-258-7158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer - Plastic Fabrication</td>
<td>Total Plastics</td>
<td>450 East Pima Street, 602-252-6200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Development</td>
<td>McCormack Baron Salazar Inc</td>
<td>808 South 7th Avenue, 602-252-1944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Armando’s Mexican Food</td>
<td>2001 South 7th Avenue, 602-340-9599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Comedor Guadalajara</td>
<td>1830 South Central Avenue, 602-253-8299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Coyote Kitchen</td>
<td>490 East Pima Street, 602-420-9337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>El Portal Restaurant</td>
<td>117 West Grant Street, 602-271-0521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>La Canasta</td>
<td>723 South 7th Avenue, 602-254-7295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Lo Lo’s Chicken Waffles</td>
<td>10 West Yuma Street, 602-340-1304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Liyuen Restaurant</td>
<td>1602 South 7th Avenue, 602-238-9688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>New Garden Restaurant</td>
<td>823 South Central Avenue, 602-254-9110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Fast Food</td>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>1850 South 7th Street, 602-252-4532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Fast Food</td>
<td>Taco Bell</td>
<td>1802 South 7th Street, 602-258-6166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Awning &amp; Patio</td>
<td>American Homesteaders</td>
<td>1234 South 7th Street, 602-254-8500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Cabinets</td>
<td>Indwell Woods</td>
<td>102 West Maricopa Fwy, 602-268-9500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Countertops &amp; Cabinets</td>
<td>Arizona’s Best Cabinets</td>
<td>1755 South Central Avenue, 602-256-7662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Countertops &amp; Cabinets</td>
<td>Axis Interiors</td>
<td>1517 South 1st Avenue, 602-253-8122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Doors &amp; Screens</td>
<td>Screen Company of America</td>
<td>1017 South 3rd Street, 602-374-2288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Electronics</td>
<td>Apache Redemption &amp; Electronics Inc.</td>
<td>313 W. Apache St., 602-254-0613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Flooring &amp; Carpet Recycling</td>
<td>A1 Planet Recycling</td>
<td>Carpet Supplies, 1600 S. Central Ave., 602-258-5600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Outdoor Furniture</td>
<td>Arizona Cushions &amp; Umbrella</td>
<td>21 East Papago Street, 602-253-7212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Pool Equipment &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>Maxi-Sweep Inc</td>
<td>613 East Grant Avenue, 602-272-5932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Print Shop</td>
<td>Whitten Printers</td>
<td>1001 South 5th Street, 602-258-6406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Printer, Screen</td>
<td>Abet Screen Printing</td>
<td>354 West Mohave Street, 602-334-1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Range Hood, Fans &amp; Ventilators</td>
<td>Universal Metal Industries Inc</td>
<td>800 West Grant Street, 602-251-3654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Rentals</td>
<td>Performance Trailers-Arizona</td>
<td>723 East Buckeye Road, 602-528-0899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Store</td>
<td>Panchita Dollar Store</td>
<td>302 West Yavapai Street, 602-252-0889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Store</td>
<td>Shante Beauty &amp; Cosmetic Products</td>
<td>730 S. 15th Ave., 602-495-1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Universal Barber College</td>
<td>1202 South 7th Avenue, 602-262-9904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Universal Barber College</td>
<td>802 South 15th Avenue, 602-262-9904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services – Alteration</td>
<td>Economy Clothing</td>
<td>730 South 15th Avenue, 602-252-6353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Services - Business Mgmt Consultant .... QOHSG Inc, 1045 South 8th Avenue, 602-374-2590
Services - Carpet Cleaning...................... Performance Carpet Service, 49 West Pima Street, 602-493-3638
Services – Distribution ......................... CP Distribution, 301 East Buckeye Road, 602-276-7300
Services – Locksmith .............................. Aady Locksmith, 8 East Buckeye Road, 623-321-4853
Services – Mailing ................................. AEX Courier, 424 East Buckeye Road, 602-716-5528
Services – Mailing ................................. Hot Shot Delivery, 236 East Pima Street, 602-277-4747
Services – Plumbing .............................. George Brazil Services: N. Phoenix, 1414 S. 12th Ave., 602-789-7555
Services – Plumbing .............................. George Brazil Services, 102 West Maricopa Fwy, 602-257-9000
Services - Radio & TV Repair ................. Hi Beam Radio & TV Repair, 1702 South 15th Avenue, 602-262-9245
Services - Tax Preparation & Accounting .. Mil Service, 1024 South 1st Avenue, 602-258-3731
Services – Towing ................................. 1A Towing, 1830 South Central Avenue, 480-455-5167
Services – Upholstery ............................. Carlos Upholstery, 1201 West Buckeye Road, 602-256-6373
Services – Welder ................................. Bob’s Iron Shop, 2043 South 3rd Drive, 602-253-5320

Sports Promoters ................................. Professional Sports Services Inc, 605 East Grant Street, 602-252-4202

Storage - Mobile Storage & Offices ...... South West Mobile Storage, 902 South 7th Street, 602-257-4484
Storage Facility ................................. Harlem Globetrotters Warehouse, 508 East Buckeye Road, 602-307-9231
Storage Facility – Cold ......................... AZ Ice & Cold Storage, 307 East Buckeye Road, 602-253-3102

Supplier – Pipes/Plumbing ...................... Thorson Keenan Industrial, 1712 S. Central Ave., 602-252-3494
Supplier – Stone ................................. Majestic Stone Import, 156 East Mohave Street, 602-253-7800

Wholesaler - Adhesive & Glues ............. R S Hughes Co, 236 East Pima Street, 602-275-5565
Wholesaler – Florist .............................. Roy Houff Co. Florist, 1606 South 1st Avenue, 602-256-7666
Wholesaler - Foam Rubber ...................... Quality Foam, 26 East Pima Street, 602-254-6771
Wholesaler – Meat ............................... Mc Reynolds Farms Inc, 307 East Buckeye Road, 602-269-6788
Wholesaler – Meat ............................... Mexico Food Inc, 307 East Buckeye Road, 602-712-1400
Wholesaler – Trucks ......................... LTS Co, 1345 West Grant Street, 602-254-1306
## Appendix C: Key Informant Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliation</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luis Enriquez</td>
<td>Director, Adult Education Friendly House</td>
<td>September 28, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Frietz</td>
<td>City of Phoenix Neighborhood Services Division</td>
<td>October 24, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Kurtenbach</td>
<td>Lieutenant, South Mountain Precinct Phoenix Police Department</td>
<td>November 16, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Preston</td>
<td>Program Manager Rebuilding Together</td>
<td>January 26, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildy Saizow</td>
<td>President of the Board Arizonans for Gun Safety</td>
<td>January 27, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Craig Thatcher</td>
<td>Executive Dean College of Nursing &amp; Health Innovation Arizona State University</td>
<td>February 8, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick Johnson</td>
<td>Captain &amp; Paramedic Phoenix Fire Department</td>
<td>February 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Rowland</td>
<td>Facilitator Collaborative for Neighborhood Transformation</td>
<td>February 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Arnold Jackson</td>
<td>Executive Director &amp; COO Tanner Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>February 17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Choate</td>
<td>Programs Operation Manager &amp; Research Analyst Center for Violence Prevention &amp; Community Safety Arizona State University</td>
<td>February 18, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Pearson</td>
<td>Associate Director Programs St. Luke’s Health Initiatives</td>
<td>February 23, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Lee</td>
<td>Vice President &amp; Community Relations Officer Global Philanthropy JP Morgan Chase</td>
<td>March 8, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Cea</td>
<td>Area Manager Arizona Public Service</td>
<td>March 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Dean</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO Greater Phoenix Urban League</td>
<td>March 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacky Alling</td>
<td>Vice President Programs &amp; Tony Banegas Program Officer Arizona Community Foundation</td>
<td>March 24, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Ordóñez Olivas</td>
<td>Executive Director &amp; CEO Phoenix Revitalization Corporation</td>
<td>April 13, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Central City South Quality of Life Plan Strategies and Sub-Strategies

Community-Defined Strategies and Sub-Strategies in Central City South – 2010 *

1. Recreation
   - Increase recreation/leisure participation
     - Expand awareness of existing and non-traditional programs
     - Create new partnerships for financial and program support
   - Maintain affordability of programs
   - Create major cultural and performing arts events
     - Encourage socialization
     - Stimulate the mind
   - Develop new leisure destinations (e.g., gyms, movie theatre, water park)
   - Increase sports programming
     - Create business support/sponsorships
     - Collaboration/training/workshops/coaches

2. Health
   - Promote affordable healthcare
   - Create healthy family service centers
   - Promote health education at grassroots level
   - Establish and promote healthy lifestyle fitness programs
   - Expand community gardens
     - Encourage socialization
     - Provide education on healthy eating

3. Services
   - Increase availability of human services programs
   - Create a media plan and promote the community
     - Expand CCS newsletter to include service providers/businesses
     - Create bi-monthly community TV show
     - Develop Central City South blog and other internet communication tools
     - Create local business list for display at strategic locations
     - Develop marquees for community announcements

* A representative summary of core strategies and sub-strategies emerging from the Central City South Quality of Life Plan. This summary reflects the most recently expressed vision of residents and stakeholders of Central City South neighborhoods west of Central Avenue (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2010).
4. **Individual Development**
   - Increase employment/jobs
     - Establish community career days
     - Create local jobs clearinghouse
     - Promote use of HOPE VI career center
     - Recruit postings for jobs outside of community
   - Enhance education
     - Improve at all levels: Pre-K through university education
     - Reduce high school dropout rate
     - Advocate for quality and accountability in educational instruction
     - Promote positive parenting and involvement
     - Promote community engagement and volunteerism
     - Establish centralized library of scholarship information
     - Offer satellite high school and college classes at library
     - Expand after school tutoring
   - Offer community training and workshops
     - Increase grassroots computer and green technology training
     - Establish local service career training center
     - Provide life skills education
     - Create teen “work ethics” program

5. **Housing**
   - Provide education and intervention on lead poisoning
   - Create livable housing
     - Establish community “fix-it” teams
     - Develop volunteer opportunities for businesses
     - Seek grant funding
   - Construct housing on vacant lands
   - Enforce and change codes for landlord accountability

6. **Economic Development**
   - Promote Central City South as viable location for retail and other larger businesses
   - Create a farmer’s market
   - Increase ease of utility payments
     - Establish local pay stations
     - Provide on-line payment training
   - Create small business renaissance zones
     - Provide small business grants and education
     - Acquire and promote small business incubator sites
   - Beautify business properties
     - Educate business owners
     - Develop revenue-generating community owned centers/co-ops

* A representative summary of core strategies and sub-strategies emerging from the Central City South Quality of Life Plan. This summary reflects the most recently expressed vision of residents and stakeholders of Central City South neighborhoods west of Central Avenue (Phoenix Revitalization)
6. **Economic Development (continued)**
   - Strengthen business networks
     - Develop network that models positive leadership
     - Utilize networks to provide financial support to Central City South programs
     - Encourage residents to shop locally
   - Establish hiring clearinghouses for local businesses

7. **Transportation**
   - Upgrade local bus stops
   - Enhance pedestrian walking lights
   - Enhance public transportation
     - Acquire connector bus
     - Maintain current bus routes
     - Expand light rail into community
   - Improve surface streets and install speed bumps as appropriate
   - Improve 11th Avenue railroad tracks

8. **Golden Threads**
   - Promote community pride
     - Create oral and art history programs
     - Develop monumental artistic community gateway projects
   - Increase community safety
     - Increase awareness of fire station locations and services
     - Establish Fire Station volunteer efforts
     - Educate and promote responsible pet ownership
     - Promote community engagement in crime reduction efforts
   - Expand neighborhood beautification efforts
     - Create a “Keep our Neighborhoods Clean” campaign
     - Include public art to enhance existing structures
     - Increase number of trees
   - Build relationships among neighbors
     - Increase recognition and celebration venues
     - Increase opportunities for neighbors to meet

* A representative summary of core strategies and sub-strategies emerging from the Central City South Quality of Life Plan. This summary reflects the most recently expressed vision of residents and stakeholders of Central City South neighborhoods west of Central Avenue (Phoenix Revitalization Corporation 2010).
### Appendix E: Logic Model Matrix for Healthy Communities Model

**Goal:** To bolster community assets to build local capacity and leverage resources to create safe, healthy and positive neighborhoods to work, play and raise families.

*Note: This matrix is organized around the Healthy Communities Model (see p. 43)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Communities Model</th>
<th>Level 1: Basic Safety and Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Neighborhood Impacts
Residents feel safe and secure in homes, on streets, in neighborhoods, in schools, and in businesses.

#### Impact Indicators
- Community Safety Index**
- Community Trust Index**

#### Investment Options
- **Desired Outcome Examples (Bulleted)**
- **Program Examples (Italicized)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Outcome Options</th>
<th>Program Examples</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase housing quality</td>
<td><em>Housing rehabilitation programs</em></td>
<td># Code Violations Property Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fire safety programs</em></td>
<td># homes repainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Yard clean-ups</em></td>
<td># fire hazards removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># yards refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stabilize safety of neighborhood</td>
<td><em>Neighborhood watch programs</em></td>
<td># Violent/Property Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Community policing programs</em></td>
<td># Child Abuse/Neglect Incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anti-Bullying programs in schools</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage development/availability of affordable housing</td>
<td><em>Habitat for Humanity infill programs</em></td>
<td># of new Habitat homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Legislative support for subsidized housing</em></td>
<td>% of households subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Low-cost housing protection in redevelopment</em></td>
<td>% of new residences affordable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Facilitate building, improvement & retention of neighborhood assets

  * Storefront renovation programs
  * Curb appeal/street beautification programs
  * Increase availability of family resource centers

• Strengthen neighborhood cohesion and social support systems

  * Neighborhood open houses with precinct police
  * Promotora programs
  * Teen mentor programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Asset Building Prog. Serv. Nhd.</th>
<th># empty storefronts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Local Businesses in Neighbrhd.</td>
<td># street trees planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># new family resource centers</td>
<td># residents in police wkshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Citizen Organizations</td>
<td># of FTE promotoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Feeling Social Support Indx**</td>
<td># of teen mentors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Healthy Communities Model

### Level 2: Capacity Building

**Neighborhood Impacts**

Neighborhood has access to full range of health, education, recreation, employment and human service programs and organizations.

**Impact Indicators**

Number of health, education, recreation, employment, and human services programs.

Community Building Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Options</th>
<th>Program Output Examples</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desired Outcome Examples (Bulleted)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Examples (Italicized)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote economic viability</strong></td>
<td>Small business assistance</td>
<td>Median household income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment/retention of local stores/services</td>
<td>% unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial stability courses</td>
<td># business plans developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase opportunities for job training, workforce development and employment</strong></td>
<td>Increased technical education in high schools</td>
<td>% JOBS participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth internships in local businesses/nonprofits</td>
<td>employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community college access programs</td>
<td># auto repair classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate development of community goals for health &amp; human services programs</strong></td>
<td>Neighborhood-based surveys of program needs</td>
<td># attending public hearings/mtgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of new roles for faith community</td>
<td># implemented program goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded community needs focus for HOAs</td>
<td>Completed survey &amp; recom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of res. served by new prog. # of com projects on agendas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ensure health and human services are accessible</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase health-care education at senior centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize food stamp access for those eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase counseling programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ensure health and human services are culturally appropriate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of multi-cultural providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health education materials in multi. languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide interpreter services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Encourage health promotion/disease prevention in schools/workplace</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase health choices curricula in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare professionals in comm. mtgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident medical profiles for first responders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monitoring community health indicators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic vital signs assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of service gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Enhance public transportation systems</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dial-a-ride programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand bus routes in com./neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer medical /food transport. services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enhance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengthen core educational systems</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase learning technology/software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch American Dream Academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Rodel math/science programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong># SNAP/ TANF/ AHCCCS enrollees</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need/Accessibility Ratio (Index)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong># of seniors in health wrkshops</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled of eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># counseling contact hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong># of culturally appropriate prog.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% multicultural service providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>% low birth-weight babies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># physically healthy days/month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Completed supply inventory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed gap analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>% minutes awaiting dial-a-ride</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># bus stops/square mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># volunteers offering transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>% teen dropout rate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math/Reading Proficiency Scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>An Assessment for the Neighborhood Advocacy Team</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared for: Valley of the Sun United Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Initiative in Central City South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Strengthen community-based institutions and local anchors

  *Provide capacity building technical assistance*
  *Resources for anchor institution expansion*
  *Provide IT equipment for data base mgmt.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Anchor institutions in community</th>
<th># Health/H.S. programs in com.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># orgs with tech. asst. prog.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new anchor inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># orgs w/ data mgnt. systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Healthy Communities Model  
*p* Level 3: Self-Sufficiency*

**Neighborhood Impacts**

Neighborhood has the capacity to mobilize its own assets, tools, expertise, and technical assistance for self-sufficiency.

**Impact Indicators**

Community Resilience Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Options</th>
<th>Program Output Examples</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *• Provide early learning and child development opportunities*  
*Increase Head Start programs*  
*Implement “Success by Six” initiatives*  
*Training for home-based childcare providers* | *# students in Head Start*  
*# students in “Success by Six”*  
*# training modules completed* | *# E.L./C.D. Program Participants*  
*# Parenting Classes* |
| *• Broaden educational support systems*  
*High school entrepreneurship curricula*  
*Junior Achievement programs*  
*Accelerated college transfer courses* | *# student entrep. certificates*  
*# students w/ business sponsor*  
*#High school coll. credit SCH* | *% High school to coll/tech school*  
*% students in clubs/after School* |
| *• Provide arts, culture, recreation and leisure activities for all ages*  
*Expanded YMCA programming*  
*Increased community sports programming*  
*Intergenerational Arts programs* | *# of Y teen programs*  
*% res. involved in team sports*  
*# child/senior programs* | *% adherence NRPA standards*  
*# rec./leisure program participants* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a life-long learning environment</td>
<td>Re-entry programs for formerly incarcerated, Adult continuing education programs, Com. capacity development across lifespan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote civic engagement in neighborhood/community</td>
<td>Voter registration drives, Funding for community action groups, Support for neighborhood associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase opportunities for social engagement in communities</td>
<td>Street cookouts/neighborhood festivals, Add capacity to senior centers, More neighborhood social clubs (hobbies, spts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen community infrastructure to maximize local decision making</td>
<td>Community leadership development programs, Community coalition building, Local asset capacity building for non-profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase resource and idea contributions from local organizations</td>
<td>Action planning training programs, Neighborhood-based volunteering programs, Neighborhood town halls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% successful reintegration</td>
<td># def. by comm. goals/eval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% community capacity students</td>
<td># in personal enrichment programs, # financial stab/enhcnt. participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% registered voters</td>
<td>% voting in local elections, # volunteer hours per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% membroship in neigh. assoc.</td>
<td>% involved in neighborhood orgs., # participating in com. Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% residents at outdoor events</td>
<td>% feeling control over decisions, # new leaders in community orgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% seniors in center programs</td>
<td>% local residents on nonprof. boards, % community projects run by locals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase self-reliance for community resource development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Grant writing and donor cultivation assistance</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Advocacy and public policy training</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Social entrepreneurship training</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># dollars of external funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># local res. in elected positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># outside consultants used for technical assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of nonprofits self-sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase in funding from business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Healthy Communities Model

### Level 4: Resiliency and Empowerment

#### Neighborhood Impacts
Residents are unified around a vision, and have the capacity to move the neighborhood toward this ideal. Residents have strong neighborhood commitment and identity. Neighborhood has capacity to adapt to changing problems and opportunities. Residents are satisfied with the neighborhood as a strong and vibrant place to live, work, and play.

#### Impact Indicators
Community Innovation Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Options</th>
<th>Program Output Examples</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desired Outcome Examples (Bulleted)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Examples (Italicized)</strong></td>
<td>Diversity Tolerance Index**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td>% communicating outside household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase social solidarity and understanding across diverse groups/cultures</td>
<td>Anti-stigma campaigns</td>
<td># part. in anti-stigma programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based prog. that celebrate ethnic trad..</td>
<td>% bus. refltg. local demog.</td>
<td># res. attending M.C. events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cultural fairs and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vibrant involvement of faith-based organizations in social support</td>
<td>Facilitate org. of social action committees</td>
<td>% w/ social action committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood need-related adult forums</td>
<td># need-based adult forums</td>
<td># youth with service projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning youth programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community embracing of multi-cultural beliefs and customs</td>
<td>Neighborhood multi-cultural festivals</td>
<td># of festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent multi-cultural art in public spaces</td>
<td># of multi-cultural art objects</td>
<td># of multi-cultural lead. Prog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cultural leadership programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Innovative programming for community centers/socialization activities
  - *Community for All Ages programs*
  - Best practice entrepreneurial programs
  - Technology clubs to build community communications.
  - # of res. in cross-gen progs.
  - # of res. w/ entrepr. instruction
  - % of res. using neigh. portals
  - % residents w/ consensus training
  - Idshp. roles mirror pop. diversity

- Maximize democratic norms and equal voice for all members
  - *Community forums on social equity*
  - Public agency responsiveness accountability
  - *Voter education (ballot, candidate platforms)*
  - # resid. in social equity forums
  - # govt. progs. with com. eval.
  - # voter educational forums
  - % residents involve. in decision-mkg level of community identity (Index)

- Broad-scale ownership in community visioning, goal formation, and strategic action planning processes
  - *Infuse participatory decision-making methods*
  - *Expand use of connective technologies*
  - *Import community visioning best practices*
  - % residents in decision-mkg
  - % res. dialg. on com. issues
  - # of imported methodologies
  - # of implemented innovations
  - % of business leaders in com. visng.

- Vibrant involvement of business leaders in creating community vision
  - *Organize business think tanks*
  - *Cham. of Com. leadership in visioning process*
  - *Service club leadership in visioning process*
  - # of think tanks annually
  - % C of C members involved
  - % Serv. clubs w/ local focus
  - # of implemented innovations
  - # innovative community dev. ideas
  - # re-designed community programs

- Increase individual, social, organizational, and economic entrepreneurial activity and innovation for the public good.
  - *Facilitated community think tanks*
  - *Workshops on innovation and entrepreneurship*
  - *System re-design/re-engineering best practices*
  - # hosted comm.. think tanks
  - # res. participating in wrkshps
  - # best practices imported

**For information about these measurement scales, please contact the Arizona State University Partnership for Community Development, http://scrd.asu.edu/pcd/contact-us**
Appendix F: Neighborhood Advocacy Team Job Description

Valley of the Sun
United Way

Volunteer Job Description

Project Name: Building a Healthy Community: A FireStar Neighborhood Development Project in Central City South / Friendly House

Title: Neighborhood Advocacy Team (NAT) Member

Neighborhood: Central City South / Friendly House
7th St to 15th Ave / Grant to Durango

Objectives

- To support community based neighborhood improvement plan activities that align with VSUW’s key objectives and the 4 Levels of a Healthy Community.
- To work with other community based organizations, residents, business leaders, government representatives to create a cohesive, safe, vibrant community.
- To engage in a Neighborhood Advocacy Team leadership council that will guide the community in an asset based-community development project.
- To build on existing assets in the community and involve community residents in activities.

Qualifications

Have a desire to:

- Work in a collaborative team atmosphere toward the goal of creating an exemplary neighborhood.
- Facilitate success of the project through volunteering, resource acquisition, meeting leadership, community communication and outreach.
- Build an exemplary neighborhood by creating community cohesion, focusing on maximizing neighborhood assets and building a sustainable, positive environment where people will live, work and play.

Duties / Responsibilities

- Attend Neighborhood Advocacy Team (NAT) meetings.
- With other group members, reach consensus on a community development of an 18-24 month action plan for a geographically identified neighborhood.
- Become familiar with community assets, projects, programs in relation to the ASU - developed Community Scan.
- Participate in development of an 18-24 month Action Plan that will guide the activities of the project.
- Participate in some of the periodic community development activities - smoke alarm walks, safety and health fairs, financial stability forums, baby shots and, among many others, water safety.
- Become familiar with the project, action plans and community

www.vsuw.org
development activities and serve as a positive community ambassador for the project.

- Convene other groups and community members as needed for volunteer projects, education and programs.
- Attend NAT meetings to participate in community planning.
- Lead select team activities in accordance with the Action Plan developed by the NAT.
- Participate in problem solving around the project, action plan, resourcing, assets, volunteers and implementation for the project.
- Be willing to share expertise and best practices from your field in the planning and execution of this project.

CCS/Friendly House FireStar Project

July 2010 - Dec 2011
Appendix G: Neighborhood Advocacy Team Member & Coordination Team

**Neighborhood Advocacy Team:**

Emmett Boyd  
Recreation Coordinator  
City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation

Lemuel Carter  
Unit Director  
IG Homes Branch  
Boys and Girls Club

George Dean  
President & CEO  
Greater Phoenix Urban League

Ximena Doyle  
Principal  
Academia Del Pueblo

Reverend Arnold Jackson  
Executive Director & COO  
Tanner Community Development Corporation

Sue Kater, PhD  
Interim Executive Director  
Maricopa Skill Center

Captain Paul Knobbe  
City of Phoenix Fire Department

Mike Kurtenbach  
Lieutenant, South Mountain Precinct  
Phoenix Police Department

Mimi McCain  
Branch Manager  
City of Phoenix Harmon Branch Library

Veronica Ojeda  
Clinic Manager  
7th Avenue Family Health Center

Eva Ordóñez Olivas  
Executive Director & CEO  
Phoenix Revitalization Corporation

**Zona Pacheco**  
Coordinator  
Community & Supportive Services Program (CSS)  
City of Phoenix HOPE VI Revitalization Project

**Loraine Payton**  
Principal  
Paul Laurence Dunbar Elementary School

**Ann Polunsky**  
Executive Director  
Phoenix Day Child Family and Learning Center

**Rev. Rolando Santoianni, I.V.E.**  
Parochial Vicar  
St. Anthony Catholic Church

**Dr. Ruby Walker**  
Center Director  
Southwest Behavioral Health

**FireStar Coordination Team:**

**Rebecca Castro**

**Sheila Denise**