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ABSTRACT

The subject of this investigation is the decision-making process during the survey and planning period for Knoxville's fourth urban renewal project. The Morningside Project was conceived as part of the Mountain View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan and was Knoxville's first attempt at coming to grips with citizen participation in urban renewal planning.

Background data for this study was gathered from general literature in the fields of political science, sociology and planning along with relevant reports describing Knoxville's history in connection with prior urban renewal projects. Specific information concerning the Morningside Project was gathered from Knoxville Community Development Commission documents and records, minutes of citizen participation meetings, Community Action Council reports, newspaper articles and a series of interviews with those considered most knowledgeable of the events in Morningside. The analysis and recommendations contained in this thesis are based on an application of David E. Booher's thesis, accepted by the Graduate Council in August, 1974, entitled, "A Theory of Participatory Planning."

This research led to the conclusion that prior urban renewal activities in Knoxville had a direct effect on the Morningside Renewal Project in two dimensions: at the project
level, the citizen participation structure had difficulty in becoming a cohesive unit in order to contribute to planning activities; and at the level of the overall community power structure, resistance to including new interests in decision-making was observed and documented. The Project Area Committee was able to form a limited partnership with the local public agency responsible for the project, but in its relationship to City Council, it was only able to achieve an advisory role. Suggestions for future urban renewal projects in Knoxville were made so that the difficulties experienced by the Morningside Project Area Committee in organizing, maintaining, and producing positive contributions to the overall community decision-making process can be overcome by other citizen participation groups.
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CHAPTER I
URBAN RENEWAL AND PLANNING

I. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Since the Industrial Revolution and the accompanying migration to the cities, concern over housing conditions in urban centers has taken many forms. In the United States, prior to the Depression, responses to correct the social conditions stemming from overcrowding in inadequate housing were, for the most part, supported by private philanthropic efforts. In the early 1930's, federal programs concentrated on aiding the home-building industry, along with the homeowner and lending institutions.\(^1\) By 1937, it was evident that the home-building industry was unable to meet the need for low-cost housing, necessitating the first direct intervention by the federal government in the problem of housing of the poor. With the passage of a low-rent public housing program, Congress accepted responsibility for the provision of

\[^1\] These programs include the Home Owners Loan Corporation; the 1932 Home Loan Bank Act; the Federal Relief and Reconstruction Act; the Federal Housing Administration; and the Federal National Mortgage Association.
housing to the nation's poor, beginning the evolution of approaches which has led to the present urban renewal program.2

For a time World War II diverted attention away from the problems of the central city, but with the end of the war and the resulting housing shortage these problems again became acute. In 1947, Congress established the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), predecessor to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as an umbrella agency to coordinate housing assistance programs. After a five year debate in Congress, the passage of the Housing Act of 1949 made it possible through federal assistance for cities to clear and rebuild slum areas. Under the provisions of this act, land could be assembled through purchase at fair market value or eminent domain procedures, the residents relocated, and the site sold to private developers.3

In 1953, President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs found, in its evaluation of Title I of the 1949 Housing Act, that the cost of carrying out this legislation exceeded available

---


resources. Further, the relocation of neighborhood residents brought about by programs of total clearance had created major social problems which had aroused opposition to the program. 4 Congress accepted the recommendations of the committee's report and in the 1954 Housing Act shifted the focus of renewal legislation from one of total clearance to rehabilitation of existing housing where feasible. 5 However, local responsibility for renewal programs was left unchanged—all monies are forwarded to the Local Public Agency (LPA) as defined by Section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949. 6

Another major impact of the 1953 Advisory Committee's report was the requirement found in the 1954 legislation that the city receiving federal aid must show that the project is being undertaken as a part of its Workable Program for Community Improvement (Workable Program). This requirement is aimed at encouraging local solutions to urban


6LPA's are defined by Section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 as any state, county, municipality or other governmental entity or public body authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought. The LPA may be a separate state agency subject to municipal control; a public housing authority with broadened powers; or the department of a city government.
problems and to strengthen code enforcement programs. Seven basic requirements were established as the framework of the Workable Program, one of the requirements being citizen participation in the planning of renewal projects.

Urban renewal planning money is available under Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and under various sections of Title I, as amended. Section 701 is not directly relevant to the planning of particular projects or to the process of citizen participation in neighborhood renewal. However, Title I authorizes four types of specific planning programs: (1) project planning (1949); (2) feasibility surveys (1956); (3) General Neighborhood Renewal Plans (1956); and (4) the Community Renewal Program (1959).

While not a requirement in order to obtain renewal funds, the Community Renewal Program (CRP) is an enlargement of the Workable Program and is a detailed study of the city's need for urban renewal in which the resources available for

---


8The other Workable Program requirements are: (1) adequate codes and ordinances for building construction and minimum housing standards which are enforced; (2) a comprehensive community plan; (3) neighborhood analyses to determine the location and extent of blight; (4) an administrative organization which has the necessary authority, responsibility and staff; (5) a financial plan which shows the city's capacity to support the Workable Program; and (6) a relocation assistance program for all families displaced as a result of renewal or other governmental agency.

renewal are analyzed and problem areas are ranked for renewal on a priority basis. The General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP) enables the city to develop comprehensive plans for specific areas in which renewal activity is to begin within eight years. Through the coordination of renewal projects, the intent of the GNRP is to reduce the fluctuation in real estate values which renewal in one area might cause in another. The purpose of feasibility studies is to analyze problems connected with an urban renewal project which might hinder its successful completion.\textsuperscript{10}

The project planning monies that are available for specific urban renewal projects are the most significant of the Title I program as far as having a "... direct effect on the success or failure of a particular project, and may therefore exert an immediate impact on the residents of project areas. Moreover, it is generally at the planning stage that citizen participation can be most meaningful, and that the scope of future citizen involvement will be charted."\textsuperscript{11} These monies are available upon approval by the Urban Renewal Administrator (URA) of a Survey and Planning Application filed by the LPA.

The application, which is a description of the proposed renewal area, must meet two primary guidelines set up by the URA to determine whether the project area

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 492-93. \textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 493.
meets the statutory requirement of a slum area or blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area: (1) 20 percent of the buildings in the area must have at least one building deficiency as defined by the URA; and (2) the area as a whole must contain at least two environmental deficiencies, also defined by the URA. The URA also notes the city's fulfillment of the requirements of the Workable Program and assesses the LPA's potential for developing a satisfactory plan for the area.

It is important to note that at this stage in the evolution of the program the URA did not interfere with the planning process, even after the application was accepted and funds were advanced. Consequently, citizen participation in renewal planning depended almost exclusively on local procedures. The requirements did not mandate that an opportunity be given local citizens to express their viewpoints during the planning process, except to the limited extent that this was accomplished by the vague and difficult to enforce citizen participation requirements of the Workable Program.

Enforcement of the citizen participation requirement entails, rather than administrative scrutiny of various

---

12 For a description of these deficiencies see the Urban Renewal Handbook, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., section 3-1.

codes and ordinances, a detailed field investigation of the community structure of the area involved. With problems of sufficient staffing for such analyses, regional offices were "... forced to settle for far less stringent tests in evaluating conformity with the requirement. ... An HHFA official responsible for the overall administration of the program stated the problem succinctly:"

There is no question but that it is difficult to enforce this aspect of the workable programs. We turn down very few applications for workable program certification for failure to comply with the citizen participation requirement. We must be satisfied that there is such a committee, that it is fairly representative, and that it is meeting.14

Edmund Burke makes several observations concerning citizen participation in urban renewal based upon two surveys conducted in 1964. They are as follows:

1. The survey findings reveal that citizen participation at the grassroots level ranges all the way from none whatsoever, through informal relations with citizen's groups for the purpose of interpreting the LPA's objectives, to an organized effort of creating citizen's groups and facilitating their participation in the agency's program.

2. To the majority of the responding LPA's (56 percent) citizen participation means establishing informal relationships with interested groups in the project areas. Over a third of the LPA's reported that the groups they deal with have primary interests other than housing or conservation.

---

14Ibid., p. 529.
3. According to the survey, a minority of renewal agencies employ specialists in any significant numbers. Twenty-four percent of the responding LPA's had one or more community organization workers on the staff of the agency. Almost half of these agencies employed only one community organization worker, whereas only 6 percent of all respondents employed two-thirds of all the community organization specialists. Three percent of the LPA's contract out to other community agencies.

4. Emphasis on rehabilitation is the key to the level of citizen involvement. Only 68 percent of the responding LPA's believed that citizen participation is necessary in clearance projects. Both studies indicate that renewal agencies will only develop a formal program of citizen involvement after they have moved full sway into rehabilitation treatment as a renewal goal.15

These observations are of interest in that they present a picture of how LPA's interpreted citizen participation requirements in the middle 1960's.

Citizen participation in urban renewal has become a significant input because of the increased emphasis on rehabilitation and the larger geographical area which is considered optimum for renewal treatment. Even though the Workable Program requirements include a citizen's advisory committee to examine the goals of the Workable Program, this requirement is "... seen by some as serving only a limited role in satisfying the basic need to involve people in

government and by others as an effective means of legitimizing the redevelopment process at the total city level but having no impact on involvement at the neighborhood level."¹⁶

The goals or aims of the urban renewal program have changed several times since its inception. Scott Greer capsulizes this evolution as follows:

The urban renewal program has accumulated, over the twenty-five years since the Housing Act of 1937, three different sets of aims. First, and hallowed by age if not by effectiveness, is the goal of a "decent home and a suitable environment" for every American family; that is, replacement of slums by standard housing. Second is the goal of redeveloping the central city and particularly, the central business district. Finally, as a result of deep uncertainty concerning the effects of spot development and rehabilitation, the program has developed the general goal of the planned city based upon a community renewal program.¹⁷

More recent federal legislation has had a significant impact on the meaning of citizen participation and, once again, a new emphasis has been given this aspect of urban renewal. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 "... embodies the concept that the poor can be released from their condition only through active involvement in the society around them—more particularly, involvement in the mechanisms that are designed to effectuate their release.


A basic weapon in the war on poverty is the 'community action program,' which must be 'developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served.' In light of this firm statutory requirement, citizen participation in urban renewal assumes a new significance as a rich source of experience in community organization and citizen activity." Recognition of this impact is currently expressed in the federal administration of urban renewal programs and is acknowledged by the Assistant Regional Administrator for Renewal Assistance in Atlanta, Region IV, as follows:

Citizen Participation requirements for urban renewal projects arise from our administrative guidelines rather than from specific legislative mandate. These requirements arose from and are patterned somewhat after the general incentives for citizen participation in all socially-directed Federally-assisted programs, as inspired by the Economic Development Act of 1964 and similar legislation.  

The present policy of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is "... to assure that maximum opportunities are provided for citizen involvement in the


19Letter from John T. 'Edmunds, Assistant Regional Administrator for Renewal Assistance, Region IV, Atlanta, January 11, 1971, in Appendix.
planning, development, and execution of programs assisted by the Department." Currently, the objectives of citizen participation in urban renewal are as follows:

Citizens should have clear and direct access to decision-making in all stages of the urban renewal process in order to achieve:

a. **More accurate determination** of needs projects should meet and the development of policies and programs responsive and relevant to these needs.

b. **Involvement by citizens** in the development and execution of policies and programs in order to further their own growth and development.

c. **Firmer commitment** of citizens to projects. Accordingly, the LPA shall encourage resident involvement in all phases of urban renewal projects to the fullest extent.20

In order to implement this policy and accompanying objectives, the requirement of a Project Area Committee (PAC) has been broadened from only those projects with a rehabilitation orientation to all projects receiving approval of the Survey and Planning Application after September 29, 1970. In projects receiving approval prior to this date, the LPA is encouraged to form a PAC to participate in the remainder of planning and execution. Also, the Area or Regional Office has the option of requiring a PAC in any case "... where circumstances indicate that citizen

---

involvement in planning and/or execution is crucial for successful project completion."21

Other guidelines state "The PAC shall be established in cooperation with local residents and groups. It shall be representative of a fair cross section of the residents of the urban renewal area and shall adopt no financial deterrents to membership or participation by residents of the urban renewal area."22 Further, the PAC is to serve as the forum for other organizations which already exist or are later formed to participate in the project.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development also outlines the guidelines regulating the working relationship between the PAC and the LPA. They are as follows:

1. The LPA shall work closely with PAC to assure that project residents participate in the formulation and execution of plans for renewal of the area and improvement of the condition of its residents.
2. Sufficient information about the project shall be made available to project residents to enable them to participate knowledgeably.
3. The LPA may provide the PAC with necessary technical assistance either by the provision of staff or personnel or by contracting with consultants who will provide services to the PAC. The LPA must assure that the PAC has the capacity to participate in the formulation and execution of plans for renewal of the

21Norman V. Watson, Acting Assistant Secretary, Renewal and Housing Management, "Requirement for Project Area Committee in All Projects," memorandum to all Regional Administrators for Renewal Assistance, Department of Housing and Urban Development, September 29, 1970.

area and improvement of the condition of its residents.

4. The LPA may also make arrangements with the PAC for the PAC to assist in the utilization of residents in various capacities in the project such as interviewers or relocation aides. Arrangements may include the PAC's selecting residents or setting up training programs for them.

The LPA is required to make a statement as a part of its Survey and Planning Application on the agency's plans and policies to meet these objectives. Acceptability of the application is contingent on the approval of this report, along with subsequent visits by a Regional Office representative to assure that the PAC has been established in accordance with HUD policy.

The problem to which this thesis is specifically addressed is the development of the citizen participation process in Knoxville's Morningside Urban Renewal Project as a case study of citizen participation in an urban renewal project. This project is the Knoxville Housing Authority's (KHA, the designated LPA) first efforts to involve project residents in renewal planning and the first such participation

---

23 Ibid., pp. 1-3.


25 In March, 1973, the Knoxville Housing Authority became the Knoxville Community Development Commission (KCDC). For the purposes of this thesis, KCDC is referred to as KHA.
by area residents in a planning activity. The evaluation of this effort in citizen participation is based on determining the impact Morningside's PAC has had in the planning process and the level of power in decision-making which this vehicle for citizen participation has attained in light of current HUD guidelines.

II. IMPORTANCE OF INVESTIGATION TO URBAN PLANNING

As urban renewal has evolved from a concept of the technical-physical restructuring of the city to a program encompassing restructuring based on broad social goals, the planning profession also has been engaged in a debate as to how its function can best be accomplished. While there is no concrete agreement within the profession on the "proper" role of the planners, there exists a spectrum of opinion in which most planners operate.26 At one end of the scale is the role of technician in which plans are based on objective study in which physical characteristics, standards and relationships are the determinants of the plan. The other end of the spectrum is composed of those planners who see their function as providers of technical advice to local groups so that they can formulate their needs into goals.

which in turn constitute the basis for planning proposals.\textsuperscript{27} The same social pressures which have made a citizen participation in urban renewal an important element in rebuilding the city are also responsible for broadening the spectrum of roles within the planning profession.

Keyes postulates that the role the LPA planner plays is a result of the interaction between "... the professional norms of the planner and his agency, the city-wide political and bureaucratic forces, and the demands imposed upon the planner by the neighborhood team with which he is negotiating."\textsuperscript{28} Considering the recent changes in urban renewal guidelines which require citizen participation through a PAC, a fourth pressure is exerted—federal administrative interpretation of legislative mandates. The planner's role in urban renewal has become oriented to the advising end of the planning spectrum where the traditional rational planning model is subject to pressure arising from the broadened political sphere in which planning decisions in urban renewal are made.


\textsuperscript{28}Keyes, op. cit., p. 16.
Since active citizen participation in urban renewal planning is a relatively recent phenomenon, there has not yet developed within the planning profession an established model which the planner can follow in the execution of his function. Case studies dealing with specific instances of citizen participation in the planning of renewal projects, such as this one concerned with the Morningside Project in Knoxville, can aid the planning profession in the process of developing more applicable models and techniques to deal with this relatively undefined area with which planners are increasingly concerned.

III. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The legislative and social setting in which citizen participation in urban renewal planning has evolved provides a perspective from which the investigation of citizen participation in the Morningside Urban Renewal Project can proceed. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the PAC's role in the decision-making process during the planning stage of this project. In order to accomplish this purpose, the thesis is concerned with the theoretical framework of citizen participation, the social and political prerequisites which are necessary to effective participation, along with the various strategies which can be employed in participation, thus broadening the perspective gained from
the review of legislation from which the administration of urban renewal projects occur.

With this background in mind, the thesis presents the relevant sociological information concerning the residents of the Morningside Area and discusses the effects that prior urban renewal projects have had on the attitudes of the neighborhood residents towards urban renewal in general, the Knoxville Housing Authority (KHA), and the expectations of the area resident of plans for Morningside. The formation of the PAC, its operational procedure and relationship with the power structure composed of City Council and the housing authority is presented. Included in this discussion is an examination of the forces opposed to the activities of the PAC and their effect upon the process of citizen participation. The concluding chapter evaluates the level of power in decision-making which the PAC has achieved in light of the theoretical implications of citizen participation in urban renewal presented in the second chapter and employs David E. Booher's "Theory of Participatory Planning" for objective analysis. Included in this evaluation are the implications which can be gained from this case study for future urban renewal projects in Knoxville.

The conclusions and information presented in this study are based upon library materials; newspaper articles;
minutes of the PAC and neighborhood groups in the Morningside Area; KHA publications and documents; HUD correspondence, memorandum, and documents; Community Action Council reports and memorandum; unpublished reports and studies; and interviews. Those persons interviewed are the neighborhood residents which have taken active roles in favor and in opposition to the events which have occurred in the Morningside Project area; officials of the housing authority; and others who through interest or job requirements have been involved in the project.
CHAPTER II

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: FRAMEWORK, PREREQUISITES AND STRATEGIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Citizen participation is an activity which has many different connotations depending upon one's perspective and the setting in which the activity occurs. Many elements, including the skill level of the participants and their goals, the political scene, and the institutional framework, contribute to the environment and attitudes which in many ways determines the outcome of this activity. The purpose of this chapter is to explore these elements, thus providing a theoretical backdrop in which the events which have occurred in the Morningside Urban Renewal Area can be analyzed.

In order to accomplish this end, a framework for examining citizen participation is developed and the political implications of the various aspects of citizen participation are examined. Citizen participation is not a clear-cut process always resulting in predetermined ends. Therefore, the skills of the participants in their possible social settings are discussed, including the
possible costs and benefits of their activity. Finally, various strategies of participation are examined.

II. FRAMEWORK

There are as many definitions of citizen participation as there are viewpoints on citizenship and the citizen's role in society. Aleshire outlines five different viewpoints as follows: ¹

1. The citizens of a community, given the opportunity to work together to arrive at a consensus, have the clearest and perhaps the only accurate perception of the needs and proper priorities for their community. Planners act merely as organizers and accumulators of resources to fulfill the needs of the community as expressed, and to provide the necessary information to community decision makers as to the constraints, in terms of resources and regulations, within which they must plan. This view may include the right of the citizen to make a wrong decision, a privilege extended to most other decision makers.

2. The citizen can contribute to the process of community development in a kind of "Uncle Tom" way. He can say "yes" or "no" to various proposals and can possibly contribute a few bright ideas, but he cannot make a significant or specific contribution to the process.

3. The citizen must be analyzed, surveyed, psychoanalyzed, and interpreted with

great hypnotic skill. The citizen does not really know what he wants or what he needs but he is able to mumble a few meaningful words which, when interpreted correctly by well-trained social scientists, will unlock the key to solving his problems.

4. The citizen is a shotgun behind the door. The technician has the right to proceed in a scientific fashion and to assume that he is representing the best interests of the citizen unless he hears otherwise.

5. Finally, there is the "elite" view. The citizen basically has nothing to contribute, else the problem would not exist. Community problem solving is a scientific pursuit and is the prerogative of technicians.

Ideally, in a democratic form of government, the participation of a nation's citizens in the formulation of policy should not constitute a dilemma. However, given the expansion in population size and in the gamut of operations with which government is concerned, a dilemma has arisen based on "... the demand for participatory democracy and expertise in decision-making." According to Burke, "Part of the difficulty stems from society's idealized value premise concerning citizen participation, coupled with an inability to make it work in policy-making."²

The critical element which is at the core of the problem of defining citizen participation is that of power. Specifically, power in the context of who makes the final decision in a controversy—the technician, the

citizen, or both. Considering the idealized traditions of a democratic society, the citizen theoretically has the final voice in community decision-making. "Citizens should share in decisions affecting their destinies. Anything less is a betrayal of our democratic tradition." In the nation's attempt to combat the problems resulting from increased population and the expansion of governmental functions, the development of a gargantuan bureaucracy impedes the implementation of our idealized concepts of citizen participation in decision-making.

Today, the term citizen participation, as used by its proponents, means a redistribution of power in the decision-making structure at the local level. Arnstein defines citizen participation as "... the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parcelled out. In short, it is the means by which they can induce significant social reform which

3Ibid.
enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society." 4

There has developed around the process of citizen participation the aura of an ideology. As any ideology connected with high levels of expectation, "... the inevitable disappointment of these expectations tends to promote cynicism toward democratic process in planning." This viewpoint sees citizen participation in governmental processes as a feedback mechanism which allows planners, for example, to meet community needs and concurrently allows the community to consider the perspectives brought to problem-solving by the profession. Proponents of this position view citizen participation as an educational tool with the participants having a voice in decision-making, but not the ultimate power. 5

Further towards one end of the spectrum, some authors view citizen participation as an ideology purported by the bureaucratic government to sell its programs. Krause states that "One of the most important of these new


bureaucratic ideologies is 'citizen participation.'" He bases this viewpoint on the interpretation that "The only formal requirement of the federal bureaucracy, concerning participation, is that one open hearing be held before final adoption of the urban renewal agency's plan to change the community, at which citizens of the local community may vote yes or no about the plan. This vote carries no legal weight, however, as programs are not disqualified from federal funding because of local opposition." Krause defines citizen participation in urban renewal as ". . . an ideology directed by the urban renewal agency toward the poor residents, in order to energize them to act in favor of the goals set by the urban renewal agency, even if they are against the material interests of these poor residents." 6

Citizen participation, then, must be a meaningful process in which the participants engage. Positive participation can only occur when a genuine effort is made by the renewal agency to involve citizens in decision-making. Twomey states that "In absence of this systematic effort, citizens may feel that they have only a perfunctory role in renewal. Protest demonstrations, accusations, suspicion, and a general distrust of anything that smacks of 'city hall'

---

are—though negative and extreme—still forms of citizen participation, the kinds that may well arise in the absence of a meaningful process of citizen involvement. 7

Based upon studies of urban renewal projects in Chicago, Twomey concludes that a meaningful citizen participation program "... must provide a channel through which individuals, organizations, and institutions may express their opinions, suggestions, likes and dislikes during the planning of renewal projects as well as during their execution. This channel involves the identification of community leaders and institutions and the development of block clubs and community organizations." Twomey is cognizant of the time-consuming work involved in explaining renewal objectives and procedures to the participants and states that the relationship between the agency and its participants must be one of mutual respect and trust. 8

Urban redevelopment is a political process since it takes place within the government's institutional framework of decision-making. The controversy surrounding citizen participation within this framework can be viewed as a part of the continually evolving mechanisms through which

7James P. Twomey, "Citizen Participation—Chicago Style," Journal of Housing, XX (September, 1963), 463.
8Ibid.
Today, the bureaucratic structures of government cannot ignore the demands of increased citizen participation in decision-making without being accurately accused of arbitrary and undemocratic action. Krause goes as far as to state that "The long-term political consequence of total rejection of ghetto opinion have been to put pressure on the city's administration and fear into the minds of the residents of lower middle-class areas that they might be the next victim of unchecked bureaucratic programs." 10

These attitudes stem from the Western liberal tradition of individualism "... which holds (1) that power is evil and must be contained and (2) that its only legitimate exercise is based on common participation and consent."

Greer and Minar conclude that "The tradition thus hands us both rigidities and flexibilities. Our problem is to find the workable mix for the urban area. One thing seems certain: we will not be permitted to transgress the culture's long-term image of legitimacy founded on consensus. Whatever paths to action we find, they will be paths that lead through the

---


perils of democratic procedure. To put the point another way, this means simply that urban redevelopment must continue to do whatever it does in the setting of politics. 11

III. PREREQUISITES

Another element of the Western "stream of consciousness" is that all individuals possess the prerequisites and resources for positive participation independent of their location within the community's structure. However, in today's sociopolitical framework, effective participation requires that citizens possess those resources necessary to the formation, maintenance, and utilization of organized groups. Bellush and Hausknecht identify five prerequisites for effective participation—morale-cohesion, capacity for organizational behavior, leadership, knowledge, and awareness. 12

They define morale as "... those latent psychological conditions which permit and promote the establishment of the bonds of organization..." it is a measure of the "...


12Bellush and Hausknecht, op. cit., pp. 279-84.
capacity of a population to become a group."\textsuperscript{13} The psychological conditions affecting morale are linked to the social phenomenon of cohesion. According to the authors, not all groups possess this characteristic; for example, certain black populations and residents of the urban transitional zones.

The capacity for organizational behavior is a function of experience—a quality not equally distributed in society. Bellush and Hausknecht hypothesize that "... the percentage of those who are members of voluntary associations increases as the level of income, education, and occupation increases."\textsuperscript{14} The implication of this hypothesis is that those groups participating in the decision-making process are those groups acculturated in the middle-class tradition.

Competent leadership is necessary for effective participation. The problem is not one of the lack of potential leaders but of the complexity of the leadership role—both expressive and instrumental. Expressive leadership "symbolizes the values and aspirations of the group, and as such serves to maintain morale, reinforce the commitment of the membership, etc."; while instrumental leadership "... is responsible for transforming the action of individuals into effective group action ..."\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 279. \textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 280. \textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 281.
Both the leader and the group need to have knowledge of the economic, political, and social processes and issues so that they can find means of achieving their ends. Bellush and Hausknecht suggest that what is often termed a failure of leadership is in reality a failure of membership. Knowledge is essential to awareness, but it does not automatically lead to awareness which is also a function of formal education and experience. Awareness is an insight into how the group's goals or ends relate to the structure and processes within the larger community and how they might be achieved within this context. The authors hypothesize that many of the negative experiences in urban renewal are the result of a lack of awareness concerning what can and cannot be accomplished—a group's interests are only protected if it can gain some control over the process and this presupposes a high level of "substantive rationality."16

J. Clarence Davies III, who has made a study of neighborhood groups in urban renewal, states that "The most important factor determining the degree of involvement of a neighborhood group in a renewal controversy is the cohesiveness of the group. The group's cohesiveness on the renewal question will depend upon the relationship between the shared interests that provide the basis for

16 Ibid., pp. 282-84.
the group and the stakes of the individual group members in the renewal controversy." He develops a continuum of cohesiveness with religious groups and political clubs at the low end of the scale; business groups and property owners at the high middle portion of the scale; and ad hoc groups at the highest level of the scale. This ordering of the continuum is based on several facts: (1) religious groups and political clubs rank low in cohesion because their respective organizational bases do not ordinarily coincide with the stakes in a renewal controversy; (2) the economic stakes of business groups and property owners give them a rather high level of cohesion; while (3) ad hoc groups have the highest level of cohesion because they are specifically formed to deal with the renewal question.17

Wilson generalizes on the usual population skills found in urban renewal areas as follows:

Such people are more likely to have a limited time-prespective, a greater difficulty in abstracting from concrete experience, an unfamiliarity with and lack of confidence in city-wide institutions, a preoccupation with the personal and the immediate, and few (if any) attachments to organizations of any kind, with the possible exception of churches. Lacking experience in and the skills for participation in organized endeavors, they are likely to have a low sense of personal efficacy in organizational situations . . . . They are

intimately bound up in the day-to-day struggle to sustain themselves and their families. Except for organizations which are in some sense extensions of the family and the church, lower-income neighborhoods are more likely to produce collective action in response to threats (real or imagined) than to create opportunities. Collective action is a way, not of defining and implementing some broad program for the benefit of all, but of giving force to individual objections by adding them together in collective protest. The view which a neighborhood is likely to take of urban renewal, then, is in great part a product of class composition.18

This description further confirms the statements made by Bellush and Hausknecht concerning the prerequisite skills necessary for effective participation.

Along with other writers on the subject, Wilson suggests that middle class persons are the beneficiaries of urban renewal and will be planned with, while lower class persons will be planned without.19 Keyes presents another middle class bias of renewal in his statement that "... the focus is not on the quality of the individual's home or amount of income but on his inability to comprehend or accept the sacrifices and time perspective inherent in the renewal process."20 Critics of Wilson's dichotomy


20Keyes, op. cit., p. 9.
between public regarding (the middle class) and private regarding (the lower class) citizens have pointed out that when the personal costs become too severe, the middle class will object to the renewal process. Other students of urban renewal argue that the "... critical point is not the conscious unwillingness of members of the lower class to accept renewal but their inability to articulate their opinions when bargaining is going on between the neighborhood and the LPA."  

Based on an appraisal of the resources needed for effective citizen participation in urban renewal, what are the specific costs and benefits involved in the process. One author states some of the arguments against community control as follows:

   ... it supports separatism; it creates balkanization of public services; it is more costly and less efficient; it enables minority group "hustlers" to be just as opportunistic and disdainful of the have-nots as their white predecessors; it is incompatible with merit systems and professionalism; and ironically enough, it can turn out to be a new Mickey Mouse Game for the have-nots by not allowing them the sufficient dollar resource to succeed.  

---

21 Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," op. cit., p. 598.


23 Arnstein, op. cit., p. 224.
Given the demands for responsible government, the benefits of citizen participation cannot be overlooked or pushed aside. Some of the benefits are as follows: (1) participation is the right of every citizen in a society with democratic traditions; (2) it provides another form of "check and balance" for technical decision-making; (3) the process provides a forum for the setting of priorities; (4) it provides more opportunities for leadership and issue development; (5) the process supports the movement toward issue politics, bringing a higher level of rationality to the electoral process; and (6) participation can help to unite the physical and social elements of the planning process. 24

IV. STRATEGIES

The original coalition of interests which made urban renewal a political reality has weakened. "The program turned out to be less financially rewarding than the businessmen and real estate interests had expected and has in many cases been injurious to these groups. The liberals have become disillusioned by the effects of the program on low-income site dwellers. As more and more groups

24For a more elaborate discussion of the costs and benefits of citizen participation see Aleshire, op. cit., pp. 375-79.
have become hostile towards renewal, the program has become less and less attractive to mayors and other political leaders." 25

According to one author, it has become a political necessity to include neighborhood groups in urban renewal decision-making in order to give the program a broader base of support to insure its survival. "One element of this support will have to be neighborhood groups and their liberal allies, for . . . experience seems to indicate that these groups may have sufficient power locally to prevent a project from being built. Nationally, the liberal groups are a necessary part of the support needed to continue the flow of appropriations to keep the program in existence." 26

In most instances, it is the lower class neighborhood residents who are opposed to renewal. Their opposition to urban renewal projects is rational after an examination of their perspective. "It is argued that, although the program lowers the supply of low-income housing, it is beneficial to the poor because the law requires that they be relocated into standard housing. In many cases the law has not been applied, but, even if all the site residents found improved


26 Davies, op. cit., p. 206.
housing through relocation, this would still not balance the inconvenience of being forced to move, the fear of being separated from one's neighbors, and the threat which the renewal plan poses to the economic and political stakes of the lower-class businessmen and politicians."\textsuperscript{27}

Returning again to the broader picture, these interests represent only a segment of the interests of the whole community. For example, their interests usually do not include the concerns of broadening the urban tax base, or that of encouraging suburbanites to return to the city core (which they may perceive as a lessening of their political power). All groups have a biased viewpoint of the public interest; no matter how it is defined.

Meyerson and Banfield coin two basic conceptions of the public interest—unitary and individualistic. The unitary concept of the public interest is that set of ends which pertain equally to all members of the public. The individualistic concept defines the public interest as the sum of ends held by individuals—in this conception a decision is in the public interest if it serves the largest number of these ends possible. Each of these conceptions of the public interest requires a different mechanism for decision-making; unitary decision-making necessitates a

central body of decision-makers who are in a position to know the common ends, who can find the means of most efficiently attaining these ends, and who can use their power to assert the interests of the whole over lesser competing interests. Individualistic decision-making implies a mechanism which compromises individual interests in a manner which satisfies the largest sum of ends. 28

Due to the change in the political base of support for urban renewal, the LPA must adapt decision-making to a more individualistic conception of the public interest. "The successful inclusion of neighborhood groups in planning and renewal holds forth the possibility of a new community spirit. Alienation may be reduced because people will begin to feel that they can exercise some control over their environment. The political dialogue may become more meaningful because it will be concerned with issues vital to the daily lives of the people." 29

Another critical issue is the mechanism through which the interests of the neighborhood surface and are represented. Keyes postulates that "... the extent to which the local team" (neighborhood representatives) "represents a cross


29Davies, op. cit., pp. 213-14.
section of the project area is a function of the socio-economic structure and political dynamics of the neighborhood for which planning is being negotiated." He further states that "In every case . . . the local team is composed of the neighborhood powerful—those local people who are able to negotiate for the future of their neighborhood." In defense of this statement he elaborates his hypothesis as follows:

One might argue that the composition of the local team can be structured by either the LPA or powerful individuals within the neighborhood, and thereby represent something other than the natural rising to the surface of the neighborhood powerful. Yet in order to remain politically viable during the long planning period, the local team must be molded around the contours of local power. Otherwise, those vocal interests excluded from the structured team will, at some point, make themselves known by demanding a place on the community team, they will oppose renewal negotiations.30

Taking this argument one step further, one could postulate two varieties of local teams. In the first team, the members are representative of only one interest group, but are powerful enough to control the process. In this example, some interests would be excluded from participation because either they are not needed for political support or because they do not possess the prerequisite skills to demand a voice. The other type of team would come from a homogeneous project area

30Keyes, op. cit., p. 13.
and reflect their set of interests. Keyes theorizes that the outcome of renewal planning when all the neighborhood interests are strongly represented would be one of only spot clearance, while, on the other hand, when one interest group dominates the negotiations the possibility for a greater latitude of clearance prevails.31

It should be kept in mind that there are many actors involved in settling renewal controversies. When compromises cannot be reached through bargaining with the administrators of the LPA, neighborhood groups usually turn to the politicians for concessions. A third alternative is through court action; however, in urban renewal controversies, it is difficult to prove that legal rights are being violated or that legal duties are not being fulfilled.32

Not only are there variations in the interest representation found in the groups negotiating for their neighborhood during a renewal controversy, but there are also strategies employed by the LPA's in their relationship to these groups. Burke outlines five such strategies, the relevancy of each strategy depends on the LPA's ability to meet the requirements necessary for its success and upon the

31Ibid., p. 15.
32Davies, op. cit., p. 199.
flexibility of each strategy to adapt to the organizational environment. Briefly, they are as follows:

1. **Education-therapy Strategy**—participation is a form of citizenship training in which neighborhood residents work together to solve problems and develop self-confidence and self-reliance.

2. **Behavioral Change Strategy**—approach is aimed at changing the individual's behavior through group membership through which a goal or task can be accomplished.

3. **Staff Supplement Strategy**—objective is to exploit the expertise and skills of neighborhood individuals to achieve a goal with only a few citizens involved in policy-making roles.

4. **Cooptation Strategy**—a process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability and existence through either formal or informal means.

5. **Conflict Strategy**—purpose is to confront existing power centers with the power of negotiation from strength in numbers and choice in tactics.\(^{33}\)

Arnstein expands upon these strategies of participation and organizes them into a hierarchy based upon the citizen's power in determining the end-product. At the bottom of the hierarchy are those strategies she defines as "Nonparticipation"—manipulation and therapy. She bases this classification on the interpretation that "Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning

---

\(^{33}\)Burke, op. cit., p. 288-93.
or conducting programs, but to enable powerholders to 'educate' or 'cure' the participants.\textsuperscript{34}

The next range in the hierarchy approaching citizen power is termed "Degrees of Tokenism" which includes the strategies of informing, consultation and placation. These strategies "allow the have-nots to hear and have a voice . . ." but do not give them the power " . . . to insure that their views will be heeded by the powerful. When participation is restricted to these levels, there is no follow through . . . hence no assurance of changing the status quo."\textsuperscript{35}

The highest level in the typology are the strategies which Arnstein considers degrees of citizen power—partnership, delegated power, and citizen control. Partnership enables the citizens " . . . to negotiate and engage in trade-off with traditional powerholders." At the higher levels of delegated power and citizen control, the " . . . have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power."\textsuperscript{36}

The author's dichotomy of the powerful and the powerless is justified on the basis that in many instances

\textsuperscript{34}Arnstein, op. cit., p. 217.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid.
the have-nots really do perceive the powerful as a monolithic
group, as the powerholders many times view the have-nots as
a mass, not cognizant of the differences among them. In
reality, each group is composed of many different points
of view which may lead to cleavages among them, allow
vested interests to compete, and splinter groups to form.
Arnstein notes that one of the limitations of this typology
is that it does not include an appraisal of the roadblocks
which stand in the way of genuine participation.

These roadblocks lie on both sides of the
simplistic fence. On the powerholders side
they include racism, paternalism, and
resistance to power redistribution. On the
have-nots side, they include inadequacies of
the poor community's base, plus difficulties
of organizing a representative and accountable
citizens group in the face of futility,
alienation, and distrust.37

Both Burke and Arnstein note that in the real world any
typology or categorization of strategies would have many
more levels with less distinct differences between them.

37Ibid.
CHAPTER III

PARTICIPATION IN MORNINGSIDE

I. EFFECTS OF PRIOR URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

In order to prepare a foundation for understanding the viewpoints and events which have been a part of the citizen participation process in decision-making, it is necessary to capsulize the attitudes of Black Knoxvillians towards prior local urban renewal projects. As a part of this groundwork, a short history of the Black population in Knoxville and its relationship to the larger community is presented.

There are three residential areas in the city that are predominantly inhabited by Blacks: East Knoxville (the older Mountain View section and the Morningside area, now extending into Holston Heights); Mechanicsville; and Lonsdale. According to one community leader, these residential areas can be ranked by preference as an area in which to live, by the order cited. Residents of the more preferred areas "... consider themselves better off
and look down . . ." on the residents of the less preferred areas.¹

On the surface, Knoxville, considering its size and location, has the appearance of being fairly tolerant and, at times, liberal where matters of race are concerned. Situated in the hills of East Tennessee, the geography was not conducive to the development of the plantation economy prevalent throughout the South. The Black population was of small size and was mainly employed as house servants and artisans. Before the turn of the century, Blacks were free to vote in elections. Several Black families had attained prominent positions and the predominantly Black Knoxville College founded in 1875 served as a communications link with the white community. Before state segregation laws were enforced, Black Knoxvilleians, even though the community was not integrated, lived in an atmosphere of acceptance.

The migration of rural whites to the city made more acute racial differences. Many of this group were of the same economic status as the majority of the Black population and used their skin color as an indicator of social superiority. At the poorer economic levels, racial

segregation became rigidified. World War I brought some change as the returning Black servicemen pushed for legal citizenship and opportunity. Even though the "separate but equal doctrine" prevailed, a measure of equality was achieved in the educational system as far as salary, credentials, and physical plant were concerned. Black policemen were hired, but not firemen as that would necessitate the formation of a whole company because of locational problems.

Knoxville politics has been described by many as being factionalized; the issues are less important than the personalities involved. According to one Black community leader, because of the history of the Black population in Knoxville, the Black community is vulnerable to being played off against itself by those in power. This low cohesion is a result of the fact that the position of the Black in Knoxville, when compared to that in the rest of the South, has been more tolerable and, therefore, has led to a greater degree of complacency. One rallying point was the 1960 sit-ins, but since that point the unity which had developed has all but disappeared.²

The Knoxville area does not have a supply of housing of "... adequate quality of appropriate cost, size, type,

²Theotis Robinson, private interview at his home, Knoxville, Tennessee, January, 1971.
Due to urban renewal, road building, nonresidential development, code enforcement, and destruction from other factors, many units have been removed from the housing supply. In the early 1960's, new housing starts doubled when compared to the 1950's. However, from the late 1960's to the present, inflation and tight credit monies have created a shortage in the housing stock. This is especially true for low and moderate income families:

Of privately built housing in Knox County subdivisions, between 1960 and 1967, only 7.5 percent were priced below $15,000 and $20,000. With housing costs increasing at a rate of approximately 5 percent a year (an estimated 10 percent in 1969), trends in the amount of low and moderately priced housing reflect that even fewer of the low income housing needs of the area are likely to be met in the future.3

Knoxville's housing historically has followed a segregated pattern. Since World War II, most of East Knoxville has become a Black residential section. Schools have changed from all-white to predominantly Black. Blacks have moved into the area of Holston Heights and Holston Hills, but there are few other areas in which Black families have been accepted. Knoxville's housing growth, when it has occurred, has developed on its western perimeter and those

Blacks who want to move to West Knoxville's suburbs have encountered a social resistance.

Public housing also presents a similar set of problems. The following succinctly outlines the public housing picture:

The structure of the public housing program makes no provision for those too poor to afford the rents and no provision, as so far implemented in the Knoxville area, for the marginally poor. The rigid economic qualification for tenants together with the large scale nature of projects promotes economic segregation in the community and cultural deprivation of residents of "project" areas; this segregation of the poor in stark, sterile institutional complexes clashes not only with the typical community lifestyle of the affluent, but also with that of the non-project poor. The recent trends toward construction of special high-rise complexes for the elderly adds age as a further criterion for segregation and isolation. The attempts to decentralize sites for public housing have met with strong protest in affected areas not only because of the intrusion of densely populated projects, but because the poor are considered undesirable. Everybody wants to house the poor decently, but not "here." Few neighborhoods are willing to assimilate some of the poor. As a result, public housing continues to be built as large-scale projects in former or incipient slum areas, or in industrial areas, and in other undesirable residential environments.4

Further, as with private housing, public housing projects have been segregated on a racial basis. A Presidential Executive Order banning discrimination was

---

issued in 1962, but by 1965 the only integration which had occurred was two Black families living in a white project. The Housing Authority respects the preference of its applicants by allowing them to select the project in which they want to live. "Not surprisingly, low-income Negroes, who are seldom crusaders, select the three Negro projects where they think they are expected to live and whites select the white projects."  

In both the private and public housing stock are found parallel and intertwining problems: inadequate supply, high cost, and social barriers to mobility. Prior urban renewal projects in Knoxville have contributed to this situation: Riverfront-Willow Street Redevelopment Project, Mountain View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan, and Yale Avenue Urban Renewal Project.

The purpose of the Riverfront-Willow Street Redevelopment Project was to provide land for Knoxville's civic center including an auditorium-coliseum and a four-lane by-pass of the business district. Initiated in 1954 in a predominantly Black area, the civic center has been built and part of the road construction completed. A small part of the land was designated for a middle-income housing: instead 129 units of public housing were built. The original site was

---

occupied by 508 Black families, 157 white families and 183 single persons not racially identified. According to the relocation plan, 427 Black families and 116 white families were to move to public housing, while 81 Black families and 41 white families would find new private housing (either rental or sales).6

The Mountain View Neighborhood Renewal Plan covered the largest concentration of Black residents in Knoxville, adjoining the Riverfront-Willow Street project. Table I, which follows, provides some background statistics:7

| TABLE I |
| MOUNTAIN VIEW URBAN RENEWAL STATISTICS: BY RACE AND INCOME |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families (average size 4+ persons)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>3157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Families Below Poverty Line</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 1064 structures were demolished with the reuse of the land as follows: 27.78 acres residential, 59.44 acres public or semipublic; 24.17 acres commercial; and 53.02 acres for streets, rights-of-way, and other such

6Ibid., p. 12. 7Ibid., pp. 13-14.
uses. The residential reuse consisted of about 200 dwelling units of FHA 221(d)3 housing at higher rents than the major portion of displaced families could afford. The Knoxville Housing Authority (KHA) recognized that there would be a resulting housing shortage from this project. In the relocation plan submitted to the Urban Renewal Administration, KHA stated that: "Analysis of the rehousing needs of displaced families indicated a deficit in the supply of existing housing and that expected to become available during the relocation period of thirty-six months."\(^8\)

The resulting effect of the Mountain View Project on the poor was to move them to public housing, most of which was not located in East Knoxville where a majority had expressed a desire to stay. The elderly poor were further isolated by being moved to new units built for that purpose. Many of the Black homeowners forced to move purchased homes in nearby East Knoxville in formerly white areas. Block-busting real estate practices were prevalent, temporarily depressing prices (which may have helped the relocated Black families find housing, but which had the result of creating another all Black ghetto). For the renter, the Mountain View Project destroyed the largest concentration of rental property available to Blacks. Officials recognized the

\(^8\)Dennis, op. cit., p. 15.
problem, but relied on public housing as a solution, still segregated; therefore the result was to push up the demand for the remaining available private units and concurrently, reinforce segregated housing patterns.9

The purpose of the Yale Avenue Urban Renewal Project was for the expansion of the University of Tennessee with the understanding that the University would assume the share of the cost usually paid by the city. The 138 acre site included classroom and dormitory space with eighteen acres reserved for fraternity housing. Because of the past traditions of racial and religious discrimination by fraternities and the quality of homes to be cleared, the project raised very controversial issues. Since the University of Tennessee bore the local share of the cost and since both the University and the fraternities agreed to the Urban Renewal Administration's pledge of nondiscrimination, the Yale Avenue Project was completed.10

These three urban renewal projects were conceived prior to the Housing Act of 1968, which required that urban renewal projects in which rehabilitation activities are involved have citizen participation input. As outlined in Chapter I, this requirement for citizen input was later broadened in 1970 to include all urban renewal projects. The net effect of these three urban renewal projects on

Black Knoxvillians was to view urban renewal as a process to take away their homes without providing a means for them to make choices concerning their future.

A situation was created in which feelings of helplessness; fear for their future welfare; and distrust of government, especially directed toward the KHA, prevailed. When persons in the Morningside area were interviewed, comments such as the following were made when asked what they thought the effect of prior urban renewal projects had been:

— Urban renewal was viewed as a threat to the whole community.11

— In the past (Mountain View Project) no one knew what was happening . . . given no voice . . . people were just to follow orders. It is being said that persons in the community have had heart attacks and died over losing their homes.12

— Urban renewal is a way of procuring federal monies for construction and architectural firms . . . a method to bring whites back to the inner city . . . Blacks used to dominate this area, urban renewal is a way to ensure control by whites . . . Urban renewal is being perpetrated to lessen Black power and to make Blacks dependent on the system—they cannot buy equivalent housing, so are at the mercy of public housing, making them dependent on the system.13


12 Patricia Peterson, private interview at her office, Knoxville, Tennessee, January, 1971.

—Effect of Mountain View was to scare people and make them want to move out, but the only place they have to move to is bad white housing.14

—People need a place to be relocated to, many were pushed out of Mountain View like cattle into project homes.15

—Opposition is not to urban renewal, but to the hypocrisy and deception of the people managing it. Urban renewal is to help people, in this community it has only put a handicap on people.16

—When Urban Renewal is involved, the people never get a fair shake—financially it is just a way for the housing authority to get what it wants. Seems like urban renewal always comes to a Black area forcing them to move further east, confining them to one area.17

—People in neighborhood are desperately against it . . . most outrageous thing ever perpetrated on the public, simply communism.18

These comments and others not included can be summarized by the following statement from Theotis Robinson, City Councilman:


15Reverend Alphonzo Hubbard, private interview at his home, Knoxville, Tennessee, January, 1971.

16Thomas Lovely, private interview at his home, Knoxville, Tennessee, January, 1971.


18Evelyn Hazen, private interview at her home, Knoxville, Tennessee, January, 1971.
Urban Renewal in Knoxville has been a tragedy, the way it has been carried out shows the high-handed tactics of the KHA—as a result the work of urban renewal in Knoxville would be defined by people as land acquired by KHA from property owners and leveled—complete removal of neighborhoods. People are afraid and see it as a threat and not a way of finding better environmental conditions.\textsuperscript{19}

II. ESTABLISHMENT OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

On February 22, 1968, at the direction of the Knoxville City Council, KHA submitted a Survey and Planning Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the Morningside Urban Renewal Area. The need for this project was established by the Mountain View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan developed in the late 1950's. The first part of that plan was at this time in the execution stage. Morningside (Tennessee Project R-111) covered the remaining portion of the plan area "... in order to carry out the general neighborhood planning objectives and furnish a sound and stable area to complement and perfect the redevelopment which has already commenced ..."\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{19}Robinson, interview, January, 1971.

HUD approved the application on June 11, 1967, for the amount of $338,772. These monies would enable KHA to make detailed studies and plans for the Morningside area. A federal grant ($7,082,000) was reserved for project execution.

The following is an outline of the urban renewal project survey and planning process presented so that the sequence of citizen participation events has a framework.

I. The City Council and KHA submit a Survey and Planning Application to HUD to study the area in detail.

II. HUD approves the application and signs a contract for a Planning Advance with the KHA. At that time a federal grant is reserved, which is to be used as the maximum amount if the project goes into execution. The study results must be completed within eighteen months or the federal grant reservation expires.

III. Survey and Planning stage elements include:

A. Community requirements. The Workable Program for Community Improvement must be in effect, and urban renewal proposals must adhere to this.

B. Project area conditions. Includes the present character of the land by acreage, improved or unimproved; building conditions; adequacy of public facilities, such as schools, streets, libraries, and parks; and environmental deficiencies, such as overcrowding, obsolete building types, incompatible land uses; and inadequate streets.

C. Urban renewal plan. The official plan for the study area which outlines planning objectives, proposed renewal actions, reuse of the land, zoning requirements, building requirements, access, land acquisition and disposition,
street layout, cost and method of financing, and a workable method of relocating families, individuals, and businesses.

D. Report on planning proposals. Includes zoning proposals, the justification for proposed uses, and how the plan ties in with the master plans for the city and neighborhood.

E. Minority group considerations. Steps are taken to ensure that there will be no discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin in the carrying out of an urban renewal project.

F. Community organization data and citizen participation. Social and economic data is gathered to identify the problems of neighborhood residents and a system of referrals is developed to solve these problems. The residents are organized to help in planning the area.

G. Rehabilitation. Studies are made to determine which buildings are capable of rehabilitation and whether residents can afford financially to make improvements. Property rehabilitation standards are developed to be used as minimum standards in repairing structures (based on local building and housing codes, but can be more stringent).

H. Land Acquisition. Properties to be acquired are listed and mapped based on (1) building conditions; (2) planning considerations; and (3) environmental deficiencies. All properties with substandard structures will be purchased and demolished by the KHA. Other properties can be acquired because of planning considerations (land for street widening, parks, schools, and land assemblage for marketable tracts). Environmental deficiencies are (1) narrow lots; (2) houses too close to right-of-way; (3) overcrowding of structures not rehabilitable [sic].

I. Relocation. A relocation plan is prepared to ensure that all displaced families, individuals, and businesses
provide the full opportunity of moving to decent, safe, and sanitary housing within financial means; conveniently located on a nondiscriminatory basis and carried out with a minimum of hardship.

J. Project improvements. Planning for streets, curbs and gutters, sidewalks, waterlines, sewers, streetlighting, police and fire communication systems, and other public-owned improvements.

K. Land disposal. Studies include land reuse and marketability, availability of mortgage financing, preliminary plot preparation, and coordination with the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) on the suitability of the land.

L. Cost estimate and financing. A detailed breakdown of gross project cost which includes survey and planning, acquisition, administration, demolition, project improvement, interest, public facilities, and all other costs is made. The gross project cost minus the sale of the land equals the net project cost. The project is financed by the city paying one-third (1/3) and the federal government paying two-thirds (2/3) of the net project cost. The city's share can be paid by the amount of money it spends on public physical improvements and cash.

The above documentation is referred to as the Final Project Report Part I of the Application for Loan and Grant.

IV. After the above elements are complete, public hearings are held and resolutions passed by the KHA Board and the City Council approving the Urban Renewal Plan. Cooperation agreements are signed by the City Council and KHA respecting the Urban Renewal Plan and the method of financing the project. This is the Local Project Approval Data Part II of the Application for Loan and Grant. After approval by HUD, the City Council and HUD sign the Loan and Grant Contract making the project a reality. KHA then borrows money for
operating capital to carry out the project. As the project progresses the City's share and the Federal Capital Grants are made to KHA to repay the loans. 21

Pursuant to federal guidelines on citizen participation in urban renewal projects, 22 KHA drew up its own guidelines for resident involvement using the vehicle of a Project Area Committee (PAC). The first step toward PAC's creation was the formation of an "Ad Hoc" Area Committee. Forty letters were sent to Morningside community leaders and residents with the result that the first "Ad Hoc" Area Committee meeting was held October 1, 1969.

The meeting was attended by thirty-five leaders and residents invited, by five uninvited persons described as antiurban renewal, and by four KHA staff members. The purpose of this "Ad Hoc" Area Committee meeting was to elect officers (a temporary chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and assistant secretary) with the duty of giving structure to this committee so that it could organize the permanent PAC. This first meeting accomplished its purpose, but not before those having objection to urban renewal, the


Mountain View project, or the procedure used to form this "Ad Hoc" group had expressed their opinions.23

While KHA was in the process of developing the guidelines that set up the PAC via an "Ad Hoc" Area Committee, the Morningside community was organizing itself. Because of the impact the Mountain View project had on area residents and because of further anticipated urban renewal projects, the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee's staff located at their East Knoxville Neighborhood Center, began in 1968 to organize groups in the Morningside area. The purpose was to increase problem awareness within the community.24 Residents felt that citizen participation would not occur in the Morningside Project area unless they organized themselves. In February, 1969, a Steering Committee was elected by area residents. At the Steering Committee's request an architecture student, connected with the Environmental Study Group of the University of Tennessee School of Architecture agreed to develop plans for the site area. "These plans were to be presented to the Knoxville Housing

23Knoxville Housing Authority, Mountain View-Morningside "Ad Hoc" Area Committee, minutes of meeting, October 1, 1969. (Typewritten.)

24Loretta Bradley, private interview at her office, East Knoxville Neighborhood Center, November, 1970.
Authority if and when they decided to involve the citizens in planning for the project."25 These plans were never utilized.

The Steering Committee was formed on a building-block approach from small groups that were already organized (a group in the Isabella Circle area organized as early as 1967).26 Seven areas were designated along (1) natural boundaries, (2) social economic problems, and (3) the location of a central meeting site in the immediate vicinity.27 Each of the seven areas elected two representatives to the Steering Committee.

This committee was very active. It met with Legal Aid Lawyers to determine the residents legal rights; with the FHA concerning the 235 Housing Program grants and loans; and with City Council members, city officials, and the mayor to determine project status. The site plans were drawn up for the entire area, based on how each neighborhood group wanted its area to remain or become and were approved by the majority of the community and the Steering Committee. However, some residents opposed the plans on the basis that


this was an "outside" study and they were against urban renewal in any form.  

The October 1, 1969, meeting called by the KHA to form the "Ad Hoc" Area Committee was the first contact the Morningside Steering Committee and its supporters had with KHA with the purpose of cooperation and planning. Because of the groundwork done by the Steering Committee and the Community Action Council, the neighborhood areas that were already organized fulfilled the first function of the "Ad Hoc" Committee—the area units of citizen participation for the election of PAC representatives were already delineated.

The second purpose of the "Ad Hoc" Area Committee was to determine the number and composition of the PAC. KHA outlined suggested guidelines for the "Ad Hoc" Committee to follow. The "Ad Hoc" Committee met several times during October, 1969, and decided that each neighborhood unit should elect three representatives and two alternates to comprise the PAC membership. When electing representatives, each neighborhood unit was to consider owners and renters, persons above and below the poverty line, white and nonwhite, elderly and the nonelderly, and the professional and nonprofessionally skilled.  

---


29 Letter from "Ad Hoc" Committee Chairman to neighborhood groups, October 22, 1969.
inform Morningside residents of the election of PAC members and over 1,000 leaflets were distributed to announce neighborhood meetings.\(^{30}\) The first meeting of the newly-elected PAC members took place November 5, 1969.

In order to gain a clearer picture of the Morningside Urban Renewal Area and the citizens who were the subject of the project's planning and execution, the following social, economic, and environmental data are provided for each PAC area as Tables II through VIII.\(^{31}\)

The overall characteristics of the Morningside Project area can be summarized to capsulize the information in Tables II through VIII. Of the 870 living units, 63 percent are occupied by families (446 dwelling units) and 37 percent by individuals (259 dwelling units) with 94 vacant units and 71 units not reported. Racially, 6 percent of Morningside residents are white and the remaining 94 percent are Black. Employment data show that 61 percent are employed, 38 percent are unemployed or retired with 1 percent not reported. The largest portion of the population is renters (57 percent), while 42 percent are owners (1 percent not reported). Of the 705 persons living in Morningside, 8 percent live in

\(^{30}\)Bradley, interview, November, 1970.

\(^{31}\)Analysis from Knoxville Housing Authority, "Application for Loan and Grant," Tables 1 and 2.
### TABLE II

#### PROJECT AREA IA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>57 families (4.2 average members)</td>
<td>39 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Composition</td>
<td>96% Black</td>
<td>100% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>18 persons</td>
<td>18 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross Rent or</td>
<td>$ 48</td>
<td>$ 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income (Gross)</td>
<td>$327</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III

PROJECT AREA IB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>79 families</td>
<td>56 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5 average members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Composition</td>
<td>99% Black</td>
<td>100% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>40 persons</td>
<td>22 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross Rent or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Payment</td>
<td>$ 45</td>
<td>$ 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>$308</td>
<td>$142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Dwelling Units in Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV

**PROJECT AREA II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>131 families (4.0 average members)</td>
<td>36 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Composition</td>
<td>99% Black</td>
<td>94% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>18 persons</td>
<td>16 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross Rent or Monthly Payment</td>
<td>$ 72</td>
<td>$ 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>$392</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Dwelling Units in Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V

#### PROJECT AREA III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>76 families</td>
<td>41 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5 average members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Composition</strong></td>
<td>97% Black</td>
<td>95% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elderly</strong></td>
<td>14 persons</td>
<td>5 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Sources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling Unit Condition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Gross Rent or Monthly Payment</strong></td>
<td>$ 55</td>
<td>$ 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Income</strong></td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant Dwelling Units in Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI

**PROJECT AREA IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>57 families</td>
<td>41 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0 average members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Composition</td>
<td>95% Black</td>
<td>100% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>16 persons</td>
<td>15 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross Rent or Monthly Payment</td>
<td>$ 54</td>
<td>$ 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Dwelling Units in Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VII

#### PROJECT AREA V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>30 families</td>
<td>24 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0 average members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Composition</td>
<td>80% Black</td>
<td>96% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>7 persons</td>
<td>4 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross Rent or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Payment</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Dwelling Units in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area:</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VIII

**PROJECT AREA VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>44 families</td>
<td>25 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.7 average members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Composition</strong></td>
<td>66% Black</td>
<td>68% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elderly</strong></td>
<td>12 persons</td>
<td>9 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomers</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Sources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling Unit Condition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Gross Rent or Monthly Payment</strong></td>
<td>$ 51</td>
<td>$ 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Income</strong></td>
<td>$272</td>
<td>$176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant Dwelling Units in Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
standard units, 35 percent live in units which can be rehabilitated, with the largest portion (54 percent) living in substandard housing.\footnote{Knoxville Housing Authority, "Morningside Study Area," pp. 9-10.}

III. ACTIVITIES OF THE PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE

As already stated, the Morningside Urban Renewal Project is the follow through effort to comply with the Mountain View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan. Specific objectives of the Morningside project as developed by the Knoxville Housing Authority in their Loan and Grant Application are as follows:

I. Elimination of structurally substandard buildings and blighting influences in project areas.

II. Elimination of excessive dwelling unit density and inadequate lot sizes in certain areas.

III. Provision of new housing on the land to be disposed of.

IV. Provision of new residential units for low and moderate income families.

V. Redevelopment and improvement of streets and street patterns as follows:
   A. Straightening and widening of McCalla Avenue, New Vine Avenue, and Riverside Drive.
   B. Correction of the neighborhood internal circulation through omission of short blocks and incompatible intersections.
   C. Renovation of street paving, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks is included in this work.
VI. Utilization of land not suitable for building for a passive greenbelt area.

VII. Upgrading of the physical condition throughout the area.
   A. Alleviation of unattractive vacant lots.
   B. Removal of several disposal areas within the project boundary.

VIII. Retain the healthy cohesiveness of several Black neighborhoods within the project boundary.

IX. Renovation of public utilities including:
   A. Installation of a new storm drainage system.
   B. Improvement of the water supply system to comply with the proposed need.

X. Elimination of incompatible land uses in certain areas.33

The purpose of this section is to examine the activities of the PAC in planning with KHA the execution of these objectives; the level of influence PAC had on the decisions reached; and the relationship between the PAC, Morningside residents and City Council during this process.

The PAC is composed of twenty-one members and two alternates. Including the alternates, eighteen members own homes, three are renters, and two own businesses in the project area. As for employment, three can be classified as professionals, three as business operators, one as a housewife, three as skilled, five as unskilled, two as ministers, and six as retired. PAC members have been described as: "Persons elected to represent neighborhoods

33Knoxville Housing Authority, "Application for Loan and Grant," p. URP—5,6.
in the community who are the most eloquent, educated and
live in the best houses and/or are landlords in the area,\textsuperscript{34} and "PAC is made up of individuals who are the most
knowledgeable, who could solve their problems on their
own."\textsuperscript{35} At their first meeting permanent officers were
elected—Lewis Sinclair (TVA Economist), Chairman;
Mrs. Carolyn Groves (Teacher), Vice-Chairman; Mrs. Patricia
Peterson (TVA Secretary), Recording Secretary; Mrs. Gertrude
Holt (Retired Teacher), Assisting Secretary; Dexter Keck
(Body Shop Operator), Publicity Chairman; and Rev. C. L.
Blackeney (Minister), Chaplin.\textsuperscript{36}

At its second meeting (November 25, 1969), PAC decided
to meet monthly, unless additional business necessitated a
call meeting. Meetings were held according to Robert's
Rules of Order. This meeting established two committees:
an Executive Committee composed of PAC's officers, and a
Rehabilitation Committee. The purpose of the Rehabilitation
Committee was to choose five residential and three commercial
properties as typical rehabilitation sites. The structures
were to be chosen to serve as models with plans drawn and
before and after costs presented. The other organizations

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34}Brantley, interview, October, 1970.
\item \textsuperscript{35}Rollins, interview, January, 1971.
\item \textsuperscript{36}Knoxville Housing Authority, Minutes of Project Area Committee, meeting of November 5, 1969. (Typewritten.)
\end{itemize}
to be involved in this effort were HUD, FHA, and Bost and Associates (engineering firm chosen by KHA as site planners and appraisers). However, this committee never functioned, as none of the agencies involved sought out their participation.

The first two months of PAC's existence were devoted primarily to organizational arrangements. However, in early January, 1970, PAC, KHA and the other organizations involved had to prepare for an On-Site Conference requested by HUD officials. It was KHA's responsibility to have a preliminary land use plan prepared. This preliminary plan was prepared by KHA's consultant in conjunction with the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC). In preparation for this conference, a PAC call meeting was held January 5, 1970, in order to preview the plan and orient PAC members to the following topics: purpose of conference, neighborhood analysis, proposed land use, traffic circulation, community facilities improvement, land use and marketability study, building conditions, activities of the PAC committee, and coordination procedures between the various governmental levels and agencies involved.

37Knoxville Housing Authority, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting November 25, 1969. (Typewritten.)

38Telephone conversation with Lewis Sinclair, June 11, 1975.

39Knoxville Housing Authority, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting January 5, 1970. (Typewritten.)
The preliminary plan would keep the area residential in character. An area behind Vine Junior High School, across from Austin Homes (public housing) would be used as a park and community center. Old Austin High School, now a vocational training center, would be expanded northward. An area presently a transitional zone, located on Bertrand Avenue would be reserved for light industrial uses. Neighborhood commercial was proposed south of McCalla Avenue, between Preston Street and Bertrand Street. Public housing would be scattered throughout the project area, but some would be concentrated on Isabella Circle, McCalla Avenue and Bertrand Street, and on Vine Avenue near Bertrand Street. No high rise public facilities were planned and the project area was to be kept at low-density. The assumptions made by KHA and Bost and Associates on which the plan was based, were that the present Morningside residents wished to remain in the neighborhood and that relocation would take place in stages. The only area scheduled for total clearance would be from McCammon Street east to Wilt Street, and from Dandridge Avenue south to Riverside. Spot clearance would occur throughout the project area. Street changes include a north-south street between McCammon and Grover Drive, which eventually would
connect with Grover Drive and go to Magnolia. Also, Dandridge Avenue would be widened.\textsuperscript{40}

The reaction toward the preliminary plan and the expected results of the conference by PAC members was mixed. Chairman Lewis Sinclair "... suggested that the conference would not be very effective. He felt PAC was being pushed into something they were not ready for." PAC had not had any contact with the consultant or prior consultation in preparing the preliminary plan. The question was raised as to how this plan related to MPC development plans for the entire city, especially in connection with changes in circulation patterns. Concern was expressed over the determination of clearance areas, substandard houses, and how the rehabilitation process would work.\textsuperscript{41}

Originally, the number of substandard structures in the project area was 617 of which 583 were residences. Of the remaining buildings, 197 were classified as subject to rehabilitation (including 178 residences) and 113 buildings were to be retained without treatment (including 83

\textsuperscript{40}Georgiana Fry, "Morningside Land Use Plan Unveiled," Knoxville News-Sentinel, January 6, 1970; and Knoxville Housing Authority, "Morningside Study Area," pp. 8-9.

\textsuperscript{41}Project Area Committee, minutes, January 5, 1970.
residences). Standard dwelling units had to meet the following criteria:

1. It meets the City's building, housing fire, and sanitary codes.
2. It is in good repair and weather tight.
3. It has safe hot and cold running water with all bathroom fixtures.
4. It has all kitchen facilities.
5. It has facilities for washing and drying clothes.
6. It has adequate heating facilities.
7. It is adequately wired for electricity.
8. It is located in a good neighborhood environment.
9. It is reasonably located to community facilities.
10. It is large enough for the family.

Naturally, the subject of whose property was classified for clearance, rehabilitation, or would remain as a standard structure was of great concern to PAC and Morningside residents.

On January 7, 1970, the On-Site Conference took place at Walter P. Taylor Homes. Forty-five persons attended including City officials, including the Mayor; media personnel; the Urban League; Bost and Associates; interested citizens; and HUD. The following topics were discussed: General Plan; Neighborhood Analysis; project proposal's

---

42 Knoxville Housing Authority, "Application for Loan and Grant: Data on Project Area," p. 3.

relationship to those items; current proposals for project area land use, improvements, and land use controls and regulations; circulation pattern; and appraisal data acquisition. Rodney Lawler, KHA Executive Director, outlined some of the assumptions approved by PAC. They are:

1. People who now live in single-family structures would be able to relocate in this area.
2. Residents will get grants for relocation.
3. If housing can be rehabilitated, loans will be available.
4. There will be spot clearance in some neighborhoods.
5. Total clearance would be kept at a minimum.

The end result of this conference was a better understanding of the various roles involved in the renewal project and arranging for a Mid-Planning Conference with HUD officials in May, 1970.44

Following the On-Site conference, neighborhood meetings were held in each PAC area. The purpose of these meetings was to relate to Morningside residents the events which had occurred since PAC's formation; the structural survey, in progress; and the latest information on the programs providing monies for relocation, rehabilitation, and the purchase of new housing. These meetings were an attempt by KHA to establish better rapport with project residents.45

44Patricia Briley (PAC recording secretary), notes taken during On-Site Conference, January 7, 1970. (Typewritten.)

No attendance figures were available for this series of neighborhood meetings.

The next meeting of PAC occurred on February 10, 1970, with the result that a tour of the Maryville, Tennessee, renewal project was arranged. This project contains new and rehabilitated housing and it was felt that the tour would help Morningside residents visualize the potentials for their area. It was also stated that the recent meetings of neighborhood residents, PAC, and KHA officials were well received. "The residents felt their ideas were really being considered for the first time."  

Concurrently with this series of neighborhood and PAC meetings, the structural survey was being completed. As already mentioned, the results of this survey were of great concern to Morningside residents and were the center of controversy. The following describes the process of evaluation used in the survey:

... an experienced member of our staff makes a personal inspection of the exterior structural components of every residential structure in the Project Area. Each structure receives an appropriate score for each of the ten exterior components listed. ... If the sum of the scores received in these ten categories is zero, the structure is classified as "Standard," indicating that fewer than 20 percent of its exterior structural components are in need of repair or replacement. If the total score of

46Knoxville Housing Authority, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting February 10, 1970. (Typewritten.)
these ten exterior components is 300 or higher (with the maximum score being 370), the structure is clearly dilapidated and is classified as "Substandard to a degree warranting clearance." If the total score of the exterior components falls within the middle range of 1-299, an interior survey is then performed, with both primary and secondary components being inspected. The sum of the scores received in this interior survey is then added to the total score of the exterior survey. . . . If the sum of the interior and exterior surveys is 325 or less, the structure is tentatively designated for rehabilitation treatment. If this sum is 376 or higher, the structure is classified as "Substandard to a degree warranting clearance." If, however, the sum of the exterior and interior survey scores falls within range of 325-375, a utility systems survey is then performed. . . . The score of the utility systems survey is then added to the sum of the exterior and interior surveys previously performed. . . . a sum of 376 or higher results in a classification of "Substandard to a degree warranting clearance," and a score within the range of 1-375 results in a tentative treatment. Finally, each structure which has not been designated for clearance on the basis of structural deficiencies is then inspected with regard to the blighting influences. . . . If a structure is significantly affected by, or contributes to, any of these severe environmental deficiencies, its final rating may be adjusted accordingly.47

On February 12, 1970, KHA formally requested PAC's help in the review of the structural conditions map of the project in order to increase the accuracy of the information obtained. KHA requested that PAC member, along with the two alternates, from each neighborhood area would meet with a KHA staff member and a representative from Bost and Associates. They

47Letter from Fred W. Nidiffer to Mrs. Carolyn Groves, Vice-Chairman PAC, January 9, 1970.
would review the preliminary structural conditions map for their area with the purpose of raising questions that would allow the consultants to reach a more final stage in the structural survey.\(^{48}\) KHA proposed that the following procedure be used to reach the goal of accuracy:

I. Each PAC member should receive a copy of a map of his neighborhood area which shows:
   A. Each structure within the neighborhood, with some indication on the map as to its structural condition.
   B. The structures should be numbered and have a street address with a keyed list of owners and the occupants so the neighborhood groups could relate the map to the owners and/or occupants.

II. Each of the seven neighborhood groups of the PAC, with the assistance of a KHA staff member assigned by the Director of Urban Renewal should physically review the neighborhood on a street-by-street basis and be sure that the map is accurate and that basically the structural conditions that are indicated seem to be accurate.

III. When any question arises from the review by PAC and KHA staff as to the finding as indicated by the structural conditions map, the KHA staff member should meet with the appropriate officials from Bost and Associates and review the structural condition point system on that particular structure, and, if necessary, should go back and reexamine the structure with officials from Bost and Associates.

IV. When all the reexaminations are completed in a particular neighborhood, the KHA staff member should call the PAC neighborhood group together with officials from Bost at

the KHA office or in some location in the project area and review the entire neighborhood again, particularly those structures on which questions were raised.

V. An appropriate KHA staff member should work with each of the three PAC Committee members in each of the neighborhood groups to the point that before the next PAC Committee meeting that, if possible, all structural conditions are agreed upon by those PAC members, Bost, and the KHA staff member in each of the seven neighborhoods.

VI. The above steps will allow the next meeting of the PAC Committee to deal with any specific cases where questions have not been resolved and many other areas in which decisions must be made concerning the Redevelopment Plan.49

The above was to be completed by the March, 1970, PAC meeting. These detailed review procedures were partially brought about by the intense amount of feeling against what neighborhood residents felt was a haphazardly executed "windshield survey" determining the fate of their property. Because of a former KHA employee who became a representative of the consultant, Morningside residents rumored that there was a "pay-off" between KHA and Bost and Associates not to give their homes a fair rating. This was a holdover reaction from their previous experience with KHA during the Mountain View Project.50 Another employee related problem reinforced this feeling because quite a few errors were made


in the preliminary survey due to the mismatching of houses and street numbers. Some PAC members felt that they should have been able to make the selection of the consultant to perform the structural survey work and resented that this had occurred prior to PAC's formation. According to KHA's Executive Director, it was Bost and Associates fault for making mistakes in the preliminary structural survey and they cannot be explained away.

The end result of the structural survey revisions was that the number of substandard buildings in the project area was reduced from 617 to 482, most of which were reclassified as subject to rehabilitation. Of the 922 buildings in the study area, 14 percent (129) were classified as standard, 34 percent (311) as subject to rehabilitation, and 52 percent (482) as substandard to a degree requiring clearance. The areas with the greatest number of sound buildings were Neighborhood Areas II and III. Areas IA, IB, IV, V and VI have a high percentage of substandard structures (ranging from 50 percent to 77.3 percent).

51 Carolyn Groves, private interview at her home, Knoxville, Tennessee, January, 1971.


53 F. Rodney Lawler, Executive Director, Knoxville Housing Authority, private interview at his office, February, 1971.

At the regular PAC meeting on March 10, 1970, a list of proposed KHA redevelopment goals were discussed. They included the following: (1) predominantly residential reuse of project area with an emphasis on private ownership; (2) provision for as much low-density housing as marketable; (3) encouragement of home ownership desires; (4) staged redevelopment to avoid mass relocation; (5) provision of land for necessary public improvements; (6) consolidation of commercial areas between McCalla and Magnolia Avenues; (7) provision of a relocation plan to allow all those who want to remain in the area to do so; and (8) placing emphasis on the rehabilitation of existing structures. Some discussion concerned the structural survey process and proposed street changes (which would eliminate 30 percent of the streets in the project area). The decision resulting from this meeting was that PAC voted to accept the Land Use Plan.  

The Knoxville Housing Authority Board of Directors had already given its backing to the plan a month earlier. 

During the remainder of March, a PAC call meeting and a series of neighborhood area meetings took place, along with the opening of the Morningside Site office. The office

55Knoxville Housing Authority, minutes of Project Area Committee, meeting of March 10, 1970. (Typewritten.)

was needed as a site for the survey and planning activities already in progress and would function as the relocation, rehabilitation, and property management office when the project reached the execution stage (expected to begin January, 1971). At the time of the site office opening, a newsletter Morningside News, was distributed. It contained an article written by PAC chairman which described the relationship between PAC and KHA to that date:

Born out of controversy, PAC up to this time has been nurtured largely upon what might be called a "mutual distrust." Although controversy is distasteful to many of us, it is frequently a necessary ingredient to progress. But now that we have exploited our frustrations and exhibited our mutual distrust, we are beginning to learn that maybe after all KHA does have a concern for people. And, KHA is beginning to learn that maybe citizen participation is not the big threat that many professionals believe it is. In short, we are beginning to understand that we can, and in fact, that we must work together if constructive and meaningful change and improvements are to materialize.57

The purpose of this series of neighborhood meetings was to bring to Morningside residents for discussion the proposed land use plan, the structural survey, and the proposed street locations and improvements, in order to prepare for the May planning conference with HUD officials. Area IA and IB residents were informed that due to the number of substandard

dwellings and the accompanying blighting influences that this area should probably be totally cleared. Reuse would be a new neighborhood of single-family dwellings with a limited number of duplex or multifamily dwellings—public housing would be a last resort. According to a KHA memorandum the general feeling of those attending was that because so many homes warranted clearance that "... total clearance seemed the most reasonable manner to conduct urban renewal in IA and IB." 58 This meeting was attended by twenty-three area residents.

The meeting for Area II was attended by eighteen residents. Questions raised concerned the rating of structures, rehabilitation procedures, and the changes planned for the east end of Dandridge Avenue. According to KHA memorandum, "Several discussions followed which were very informative." 59

Groups II and IV met April 2, 1970, and discussion centered on the structures slated for rehabilitation on the structural survey. State Representative Booker was given the floor and "warned the people to be (if not extremely) careful about urban renewal in their area. He

58 Bill Alden, "Meeting of Neighborhood Group: Groups IA and IB" (Knoxville Housing Authority interoffice memorandum), March 31, 1970.

59 Bill Alden, "Meeting of Neighborhood Group: Group II" (Knoxville Housing Authority interoffice memorandum), April 2, 1970.
did not state that urban renewal should not take place, but that City Council should be made aware of the Morningside situation." KHA's reaction to this meeting was that "... even though residents attending the meeting were dissatisfied with various issues, the meeting did provide information and the opportunity to express opinions." 60 Twenty-five residents attended this meeting.

On April 3, 1970, Groups V and VI met jointly. Mr. Boyd, KHA's Urban Renewal Director, explained that land acquisition would be determined by environmental needs (the building and planning conditions relative to the needs of street widening, parks, recreational facilities, etc.). Most of the commercial buildings in this area are standard, some need rehabilitation, while only a few are substandard. Items that were discussed include the following: (1) the acquisition of residential land in the southwest part of Area V for commercial reuse; (2) the proposed change in Winona Street at the Gibbons Street intersection; and (3) possible plans for the cemetery on Pennsylvania Avenue between Winona and Bertrand Streets. The meeting was concluded with a discussion of the 235 housing program and relocation benefits. Attendance at

60 Bill Alden, "Meeting of Neighborhood Groups: Groups III and IV" (Knoxville Housing Authority interoffice memorandum), April 2, 1970.
this meeting included fourteen residents from these two areas.\footnote{Knoxville Housing Authority, Urban Renewal Area V and VI, minutes of meeting April 3, 1970. (Typewritten.)}

When comparing the attendance of neighborhood residents to the number of probable adults living in that neighborhood it is interesting to note the statistics in Table IX: \footnote{Available figures are divided into the characteristics of families and those of individuals in Tables I and II of KHA's "Loan and Grant Application." The probable adult population was calculated as follows for each PAC area: number of individuals + number of adults per family = total adults. It was assumed that there were two adults per family, which more than likely gave a higher total number of adults than actually existed. This upward calculation of the adult population is partially countered by the number of elderly in the population who would help average the assumption of two adults.}

**TABLE IX**

**PROJECT NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Residents Attending</th>
<th>Probable Adult Population</th>
<th>% Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas IA &amp; IB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area III &amp; IV</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas V &amp; VI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the size of the group that could have attended the neighborhood meetings varied, approximately the same
percentage of adult residents were actually present. Meeting announcements were the responsibility of KHA—the CAC supported communication efforts.63

The April meeting of PAC centered on preparing for the May Mid-Planning Conference with HUD officials. At KHA's request, all PAC members gave a verbal acceptance of the Land Use Maps. In order to ensure the City's commitment to support the urban renewal project, PAC formed committees to work with the appropriate city agencies. It was requested that PAC's Executive Committee take a more active part in decision-making for the group. So that this could be accomplished, By-Laws were drawn up and adopted.64 There is no record that this occurred.

At the regular May PAC meeting, it was announced that the dates of the conference with HUD officials were to be May 26-27, 1970. It was decided that on May 19, 1970, PAC should have a call meeting so that members would have a clearer understanding of what would be presented to HUD. PAC voted to leave the Henrietta Street area residential, following the wishes of residents in that area. The following PAC committees were formed: Parks, Recreation,


64Morningside Field Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting April 7, 1970. (Typewritten.)
and Community Facilities; Rehabilitation Standards; Relocation Community; Housing Programs and Social Services; and a Relocation Committee for Businesses.\textsuperscript{65} KHA never brought these committees into involvement, even though the committees were prepared to participate.\textsuperscript{66}

It was announced at the call meeting that the upcoming conference would be held in Atlanta because HUD technicians could not come to Knoxville. The following new maps were presented to PAC and would be taken to Atlanta: (1) Project Area Conditions Map, (2) Existing Land Use Map, (3) Proposed Land Use Map, (4) Property Disposition Map, and (5) Property Disposal Map. Changes in the maps were as follows:

1. Dandridge and Vine Avenues were widened on the north side.
2. The right of way will be doubled in some places on Vine Avenue.
3. Pennsylvania and Linden Avenues have been closed.
4. The playground of Catholic High School will be expanded.
5. The trucking firm on Henrietta Avenue will be purchased by KHA with the parcel reused for single family dwellings.

After some debate, PAC voted to send its chairman with KHA officials to Atlanta for the conference—some members felt that more than one PAC representative should attend. A

\textsuperscript{65}Morningside Field Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting April 7, 1970. (Typewritten.)

\textsuperscript{66}Telephone conversation with Lewis Sinclair, June 11, 1975.
formal resolution signed by PAC members supporting these proposals was to be presented to HUD officials. 67

At this point, the financial responsibilities for executing the Morningside Project became clarified. The City of Knoxville is required to pay one-third of the total cost. However, no city funds will be needed except as required for city functions (parking garages, schools, parks, and other community facilities). According to KHA's Urban Renewal Director, enough credits from prior projects in the form of utility expenses and street improvement exist to make up Knoxville's share of the cost ($4,500,000). 68

KHA requested from HUD an additional two million dollars in reserve capital grant funds for the Morningside project, making the federal government's share nine million dollars. The stated need for this additional amount was for land acquisition and public improvements. 69 A portion of this amount will be used to cover the increase in federal interest rates. 70

67 Morningside Field Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of call meeting May 19, 1960. (Typewritten.)

68 Chuck Boyd, KHA Urban Renewal Director, private interview at his office, October, 1970.


70 "Project to Get HUD Boost," Knoxville News-Sentinel, June 18, 1970.
In June, a team of HUD officials came to Knoxville to discuss KHA's progress and to review MPC's progress on the Community Improvement Program. This technical review staff of HUD represented its divisions of planning, social services, engineering, property acquisition, property disposition, and field services. After reviewing KHA's final plans for Morningside and visiting the project area, the HUD representatives presented their findings as to how the plan met federal law and HUD guidelines.

High land acquisition costs were the major problem which HUD officials found. KHA's proposal to purchase Mountain View Elementary School from the city and develop it into a public facility was a point of discrepancy (the narrative accompanying the maps contained this proposal, but the maps showed the area as being slated for low density housing). HUD contended that the City should assume the financial responsibility of a public facility and that the narrative must clearly define the land's reuse after acquisition. KHA's Executive Director stated that they would correct this discrepancy to show that the land would be used for low density housing. HUD also questioned the


acquisition of twenty-two acres south of Dandridge Avenue. KHA proposed to improve this land (a gully area) and dedicate it to the City. HUD stated that the City should purchase the land. The end result of this review was that the HUD officials agreed to recommend the two million dollar increase in federal funds. Final approval of these additional monies was expected in the Fall. When final approval is given, the second round of property appraisals in the project area occurs—expected to begin in the Winter of 1971.

On June 28, 1970, KHA sponsored a bus trip through the Morningside Urban Renewal Area as a preview to their presentation to City Council of the final plans during a luncheon that same date. As a result of this meeting, the Mayor recommended that a resolution approving KHA's plan for the Morningside project be placed on the City Council's Agenda for July 21, 1970. HUD required that such a resolution be passed before final approval of additional funding. Lewis Sinclair, PAC Chairman, made the following statement urging the councilmen to approve the plan and take prompt action to ensure its implementation:


74"Project to Get HUD Boost," Knoxville News-Sentinel, June 18, 1970.

The mutual trust and confidence that should exist between citizens and their government have largely been restored through the cooperation of KHA and PAC. KHA and PAC accept as our ultimate goal the rehabilitation and enhancement of the lives of the people, rather than merely rebuilding and beautifying the physical environment in which they live. We believe the City Council also subscribes to this goal. PAC and KHA are sure that this proposal has the support and endorsement of the majority of residents and property owners in the Morningside area. We are equally sure that there are some who are opposed to the plan and possibly others who object to any effort at all to revitalize the area. Nevertheless, the plan has been approved by PAC and in turn by each of the several neighborhood organizations. We hope the City Council will look upon this proposal as representing the most feasible plan for the redevelopment of the area, given the needs of the area and its people and their diverse attitudes and opinions.76

It is interesting to note that up until this time (July, 1970) attendance at PAC regular and call meetings was very good—an average of 86 percent of the members were present at meetings. From this point on until the end of the survey and planning process (January, 1971), average attendance dropped to 57 percent. Average attendance at all meetings during this period was 74 percent. The data provided in Table X give a more detailed attendance record (figures were obtained from PAC meeting minutes).

TABLE X

ATTENDANCE DATA ON PAC MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Number Members</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>% Present</th>
<th>Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/5/69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Attendance for All Meetings = 74%

According to the PAC Chairman, up until the time that residents were not sure of what the final Morningside plans would be, interest was very high as shown by the number of PAC members attending meetings. After the realization of the meaning of the final plans took place, interest lessened and attendance dropped.77

The July 14, 1970, PAC meeting seemed to be a turning point as evidenced by the comments recorded in the minutes of the meeting. Questions were asked about the clearance

---

77 Telephone conversation with Lewis Sinclair, June 11, 1975.
figures presented in newspaper articles. These were explained by KHA's Urban Renewal Director. A member of PAC who can be described as against any urban renewal apologized for originally nominating Mr. Lewis Sinclair as chairman. Another PAC member said that PAC had failed to do its job because it did not relay information to Morningside residents about what was occurring. A visitor to the meeting supported this accusation. Concern was expressed over the fact that the second appraisal of resident's houses would take place in the winter when they would look their worst. Frustration with KHA was expressed by a visitor who said that she had attended meetings for ten months and not one thing had been accomplished. She said "... if KHA was going to do something, then do it; that the people need to know something. They have no store, some have no means of transportation, something needs to be done."78

These negative reactions were not shared by all the PAC members present at the meeting. Two members were recorded as expressing desires to have those houses torn down which needed to be and rehabilitate the others as soon as possible. Another member said that his only purpose for being on PAC was to make a better place for his people to live. He added that he felt it was a "slap in the face" to

78 Morningside Field Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting July 14, 1970. (Typewritten.)
PAC to say that they had failed, and that PAC was doing its job and a good one at that.\textsuperscript{79}

It was with this loss of cohesion that Morningside residents were invited to a public hearing by City Council in order to express their feelings toward the final plans before the Council voted on the resolution of commitment. "The Monday night hearing (July 20, 1970) will not be the officially required public hearing. It will only be a preliminary hearing to help council men decide whether the majority of area residents really favor the plan."

Opposition to the plan centers on the number of residences to be cleared and the fact that KHA has not made any relocation plans public. There was some question as to how accurately PAC represented the community. The Executive Director of KHA responded that he thinks KHA has "... done the best job possible in spurring neighborhood interest. Nobody gets volume participation, you only get participation by those directly affected. KHA has compromised on the program in several places because PAC wouldn't concur with the plan." Councilman Theotis Robinson, who represents the Morningside Community, was quoted as saying that he had attended several PAC meetings and had observed that the people who were most vocal on the plans were out-voted. He

\textsuperscript{79}Ibid.
also said, "... that this may have been the reason that many of these people claimed that they had been denied participation in the plans." 80

It was during this period of confusion that a group formed "Citizens Opposed to Urban Renewal" for the purpose of gathering petition signatures to present to City Council. The spokesman for this group, Tom Lovely (Chairman of the local NAACP Housing Committee), was an electrical contractor in Mountain View and had to relocate. He claimed that he had never been properly reimbursed. 81 The FBI investigated him for an alleged fraudulent moving expense claim, but the court cleared him of all charges. 82 Lovely was reported to own rental property in the proposed clearance area. 83 When interviewed, Mr. Lovely was very critical of PAC activities, KHA, and some City Council members. 84 There is no record that he had attended any PAC meetings up to this point where his opinions could have been expressed. Lovely has been described as "... fighting an old battle from Mountain


View, so he is preying on those old people who cannot afford another home."\(^{85}\)

The petition contained over 400 signatures, including children's signatures, of those against urban renewal and for rehabilitation. Councilman Robinson obtained a copy of the list and gave it to PAC for analysis. After going over the list, it was found that many signatures belonged to fictitious persons, persons no longer living, or were not true signatures.\(^{86}\)

Some 200 persons attended the public hearing. After, the goals of the project were reviewed, residents were given an opportunity to express opinions and ask questions. Issues raised included relocation plans, legitimacy of the PAC, amount of clearance, widening of Dandridge Avenue, and the procedures used in the structural survey. Rodney Lawler emphasized that no family would be asked to move unless KHA could provide them with a standard dwelling that the family could afford. This statement was countered by the fact that residents whose homes were debt-free would have to go into debt again. As for PAC's legitimacy, those PAC members present agreed that the committee had worked hard to generate neighborhood interest but that it had not been truly effective in communicating the final plans to all neighborhood

\(^{85}\)Groves, interview, January, 1971.

\(^{86}\)Peterson, interview, January, 1971.
residents. On the matter of clearance, Mr. Lawler pointed out that HUD would not provide grants for the rehabilitation of houses that could not be renovated economically. Also on the issue of street widening, he pointed out that the Urban Renewal Plan has to agree with the City's thoroughfare plan. (Previously, City Council MPC, the Urban Transportation Coordinating Committee, along with state and federal highway officials approved Dandridge Avenue as a major connection road in long-range plans.) Finally, in answer to the issue of the structural survey, he stated that anyone questioning their appraisal should come to KHA and discuss it—KHA might be persuaded to change it if the reasons proved valid. On July 21, 1970, City Council endorsed the proposal by a vote of seven in favor and two against.

A week later the next PAC meeting was held. It was suggested that September 30, 1970, be official public hearing date. As it turned out the public hearing was postponed ten days. Controversy arose over who voted in favor of the plans that were presented to HUD two months

---


ago. According to meeting minutes, eleven PAC members actually voted in favor and four gave their approval by phone. Discussion followed concerning the Turnkey III program, and the proposed Isabella Circle high-rise apartments for the elderly. Also suggested at this meeting, was that a clinic be set up with a KHA staff member to answer resident's questions.90

Even though the August 14, 1970, PAC meeting was attended by two-thirds of the representatives, cohesion among Morningside residents was at a very low level. Lewis Sinclair made a statement concerning PAC representativeness—PAC members were selected by the neighborhood groups; if the representative has not satisfied these groups, it is up to them to elect someone else. He also stated because of unfavorable comments about his chairmanship that he was ready to be removed. At that point, all but one PAC member gave him a standing vote of confidence. A motion was carried to have a reevaluation of neighborhood Area IA and B. KHA stated their reluctance as most of the homes were substandard and the residents whose homes could be rehabilitated should come to this meeting. On the topic of the widening of Dandridge Avenue, it was noted that PAC had influenced the

90Project Area Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting July 28, 1970. (Typewritten.)
decision for widening to occur on the north rather than on the south side of the street, pursuant to residents' wishes. A film was shown on the Turnkey III program. The meeting concluded with a question and answer period. 91

The highlight of the September PAC meeting was a presentation of KHA's proposals for staged redevelopment. The first areas chosen as a beginning point were Isabella Circle (PAC Area IA), Saxton (PAC Area II), and the Payne-Rosedale area (also in PAC Area II). These areas were chosen as they represent the only areas in the project with the smallest number of families to be relocated and the largest area of vacant land available for redevelopment. Homes in Saxton area would be under the 235 program; in the Payne-Rosedale area, they would be Turnkey III; and in the Isabella Circle area, high-rise units for the elderly were planned. A schedule for the completion of the redevelopment process had not yet been proposed. 92

Both the 235 and the Turnkey III programs enable low-income families to purchase single-family dwelling units. It was planned for Knoxville proposed 200 units to operate as follows:

---

91 Morningside Field Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting August 11, 1970. (Typewritten.)

92 Morningside Field Office, Project Area Committee, minutes of meeting September 8, 1970. (Typewritten.)
Until the family could purchase the home, the deed would remain in KHA's name. Payment would be the same as public housing—twenty percent of the family's income with KHA picking up the escrow tab. Houses would be in the three to five bedroom range and take up no more than 1/7th of the lot size (no lots were to be smaller than 75' x 125'). A minimum income of $3000 is required to lessen the chance of a failure in ability to meet homeownership responsibilities. For each unit of Turnkey III housing, the federal government sets aside $500 to train persons to be homeowners (budget managing, minor repairs, etc. are covered). A family can build up $200 in "sweat equity" by doing minor repair and maintenance work themselves for a two year period.

The 235 program enables eligible families to get home loans for as little as 1 percent interest (interest amount depends upon the family's income and number of dependents). A $200 minimum down-payment is required. Private developers build 235 dwelling units, while Turnkey III ones are publicly developed.93

Scheduled to follow the redevelopment areas, were two conservation areas: Witt Place-Grover Drive-Payne Avenue and Surrey Road (PAC Area II), and Linden Avenue-Vine Avenue-Bertrand Street and Kyle Street (PAC Areas III and VI). A conservation and spot clearance area (Dandridge Avenue, Witt Place, Riverside Drive and Ferry Street, excluding Isabella Circle, in PAC Areas IA and IB) would be next. The last stage would be a conservation area bounded

---

by Magnolia Avenue, Bertrand, Vine and Jessamine Streets (PAC Areas IV and V). Relocation will affect approximately 400 families over a five-year period (in Mountain View, 700 families were moved in one year).94

The official public hearing on the Morningside Plan resulted in much debate over the proposed forty foot widening of Dandridge Avenue and whether it should occur on the north or south side of the street. A lawyer for Mrs. Evelyn Hazen (PAC member and property owner on both sides of Dandridge Avenue) asked City Council that if the widening is to take place, to change it to the south side of the street. Lewis Sinclair outlined why PAC asked for the widening on the north side:

... it involved the destruction of only one dwelling. Other property owners on that (north) side were canvassed and only one objected to the plan. Widening the street on the south side would involve the destruction of six dwellings and was therefore rejected by PAC.95

Mrs. Hazen's motives for requesting this change have been described as follows:

She owns two-thirds of the Dandridge area, some thirty odd rental properties. She is against urban renewal in any form because she does not want to renovate her properties. She had her tenants so intimidated that they would not


express themselves at meetings. She can be very influential . . . knows city officials from way back and she has a great deal of money.96

Her family used to own the Knoxville Farmer's Market.97

In April, 1967, Mrs. Hazen paid State Senator Robert Booker's way to Washington to complain about KHA "bulldozing."

According to Senator Booker, the urban renewal officials in Washington said that they had legitimate complaints, but in order to keep urban renewal specialists in a job, there must be urban renewal projects. It wasn't up to federal officials, but to the local City Councils to control the projects. Senator Booker authored a speech entitled "Urban Renewal—How to Legally Steal Property."98

In an interview, Mrs. Hazen stated that the proposed "... park on the south side of Dandridge is to destroy me. Urban renewal's ace-in-the-hole when they don't need to tear down a house (structurally) is to take it down for a street or park through eminent domain. This is a misuse of power."99 Mrs. Hazen wrote a twenty-eight page report describing her opinions of KHA activities in Morningside and sent it to City Council.

97Brantley, interview, October, 1970.
In October, 1970, City Council voted to approve the final plans for the project. However, a joint meeting was held November 9, 1970, with PAC and Morningside residents concerning Resolution 4101, a supplementary ordinance which proposed that the widening of Dandridge Avenue to Witt Place take place on the south side. After much discussion on the street widening and property disposition, a secret ballot was taken. City Council approved the resolution by a nine to two vote. This event was the last recorded action taken during the planning and survey period—no action resulted from KHA's attempts to scale down the project area to exclude Area VI. HUD and City Council signed the cooperation agreement to execute the project on February 19, 1971. The Loan and Grant Contract was signed by HUD the following June.

Several factors outside the control of the PAC influenced the citizen participation process. A positive influence was the change in ultimate responsibility from Mr. Chuck Boyd, Urban Renewal Director, to Mr. F. Rodney Lawler as Executive Director of KHA. Mr. Boyd was the person with whom Mountain View residents had to deal.

---

100 City Hall, Project Area Committee Meeting with City Council and Officials, minutes, November 9, 1970. (Typewritten.)

101 Telephone conversation with John Ulmer, KCDC Executive Director, June, 1975.
Morningside residents never felt that he would in any way protect their interests or involve them in decision-making.\(^\text{102}\)

Mr. Boyd left KHA in 1971. Mr. Lawler saw the problem as follows: "He has been very conscientious and is very frank—(he) should have been more of a politician."\(^\text{103}\) On the whole, residents view the actions of Mr. Lawler as excellent: "He believes in people renewal."\(^\text{104}\) Lewis Sinclair described this change in administration's impact on the influence of PAC: "Part of PAC's impact is due from the change in the administration of KHA. They have demonstrated a willingness to involve people. In the absence of this, PAC would have had some influence, but this made it easier."\(^\text{105}\)

Another factor is inherent in the urban renewal process itself—the time-lag between decisions and actions. Since Morningside was Knoxville's first urban renewal effort involving citizen participation, this process was very hard to grasp and work with as evidenced by the rise and fall of interest by neighborhood residents, the actions of City Council, and the role played by KHA. It would have been a great help if the *Morningside Newsletter* or a neighborhood

---


\(^{103}\) F. Rodney Lawler, interview, February 11, 1971.

\(^{104}\) Bradley, interview, October, 1970.

\(^{105}\) Sinclair, interview, February, 1971.
communication publication could have been circulated on a regular basis. This might have been the case if PAC had had more resources available.

Even though PAC membership was composed of persons with a higher educational-experience level than the majority of Morningside residents, this was their first formal experience in neighborhood organization. Considering all the information which has been evidenced, including the methods KHA employed in its relationship to PAC, PAC seemed to have made real efforts to perform its function. This is partly due to the leadership efforts of its chairman.

As was PAC inexperienced in citizen participation organization, so was KHA unfamiliar in working with citizen participation groups. An overwhelming factor is the set of historical influences operating on the power structure (City Council and the KHA Board of Commissioners) and on Morningside residents in becoming a cohesive unit to overcome the effects of past urban renewal projects and to deal with the expectations of urban renewal's citizen participation objectives. Perhaps, if PAC had been formed earlier, had been able to formulate its objectives independently, and had been in a position to influence KHA's decision-making process in the transition from urban renewal procedures in Mountain View to those employed in Morningside, the survey and planning process in Morningside would have avoided these problems.
In summary, PAC's decisions resulted in the following impacts during the survey and planning period:

1. Provided a vehicle for the expression of community opinion and a focal point for the cohesiveness that was achieved.

2. Pressured KHA into redoing structural survey.

3. Kept land reuse plans primarily single-family residential in accordance with expressed resident wishes.

4. Put pressure on KHA to make the relocation process as smooth as possible with no one forced to move until appropriate housing was available.

5. Put pressure on KHA to assure that the property owners who wanted to remain in the area could relocate in Morningside.

6. Influenced some proposed street changes (Cruze, Bertrand, Kyle, VanGuilder, and Chilhowee).

7. Influenced the decision to close Mountain View school and retain Green Elementary.

8. Influenced the decision to relocate a trucking company on Henrietta Street at the request of neighborhood residents.

9. Aided in strengthening the relationship between Morningside residents and CAC.
In some instances, the decisions which PAC influenced were not the ones KHA would have made. Rodney Lawler expressed his views on citizen participation as follows:

... for citizen participation, but not in all cases do people understand what is best for them, no way to explain to all people what needs to be explained. Our goal is to get close enough to the needs of the people in an area, to determine from them what they see their needs as, and to relate it back to a structured program.

He expected that the then upcoming Fort Sanders Urban Renewal Project would have a more effective citizen participation input because the background of neighborhood residents is different.¹⁰⁶

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

IN MORNINGSIDE

I. FULFILLMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

As with many pieces of federal legislation, the application of the act is determined by the responsible administrative department's guidelines rather than from legislative mandate (Chapter I). The citizen participation requirement as developed from the series of Housing Acts passed by Congress and influenced by other socially oriented legislation is just such a case. KHA fulfilled the citizen participation requirements applicable to Morningside in that the PAC was formed based on an elective process (fair representation) and that it met on a regular basis (Chapter I, page 6). These citizen participation requirements were met through local application of HUD's generalized guidelines. The June, 1970 technical review group from HUD which analyzed progress in Morningside served as HUD's method of enforcing its own guidelines. There was no indication that the Morningside PAC was not in compliance.

In its administrative guidelines, HUD describes the working relationship between the LPA and the PAC (Chapter I,
page 12). These guidelines do not state, in case of conflict between the LPA and the PAC who is to have the final say and whether this decision is to be upheld by the community power structure (as embodied by City Council) or how conflicts are to be decided before approval of federal funding. More simply, the actual level of power in decision-making which the PAC can achieve is not specifically detailed.

Phrases such as "to the fullest extent, to ensure that project area residents participate, to participate knowledgeably, to assure that PAC has the capacity to participate," are vague and open to a whole continuum of interpretations. Administrative guidelines as an enforcement technique of legislated programs, as evidenced in not only socially oriented legislation,¹ sidestep the political problem of the application of federal legislative goals at the local governmental level. This escape valve has the potential for either supporting federal legislation or serving as a means for local governments to obtain federal monies without giving wholehearted support to the intent of the program. For this reason, the level of power in decision-making (who makes the final decision in a

¹For example, the determination and application of "direct and significant impact" in environmental legislation.
controversy)\textsuperscript{2} as related to citizen participation in urban renewal cannot be made from an analysis of the local application of federal administrative guidelines. It is obvious that the PAC functioned well enough to satisfy the federal requirements for citizen participation in Morningside, but the theoretical question remains does this level of citizen participation satisfy the precepts of democratic process? It should be noted that there is an inherent tension between the needs and goals of the city as a whole and the needs and goals as perceived by a group of citizens involved in a renewal strategy. The formal governmental structure as represented by the role of city council is the point at which this conflict in perspective and scale are resolved.

II. ANALYSIS OF PAC'S LEVEL OF POWER ACHIEVED IN DECISION-MAKING

Optimum participation in any group or with a governmental structure requires an individual or group possess equal opportunity, motivation, and resources to make an effective input into the planning process. When these factors of opportunity, motivation, and resources

\textsuperscript{2}Definition as stated by Edmund M. Burke, "Citizen Participation Strategies," \textit{Journal of the American Institute of Planners}, XXXIV (September, 1968), pp. 287.
are not equally distributed, "... the possibility for a truly participative input into the process of planning will be limited." Chapter II outlined the resources necessary to effective participation (such as morale-cohesion, capacity for organizational behavior, leadership, knowledge, awareness and the desired ingredient of mutual respect and trust between those participating) and noted that different socioeconomic groups do not possess the same level of resources.

In his thesis, Booher describes the "Principle of Aggregate Interaction" which is based on the components of macro- and microinteraction.

... any structure of citizen participation in a community will reflect the aggregate results of interaction on two dimensions. First, the structure will reflect results of interaction by relevant groups and interests at the community level (macrointeraction). Second, the structure will reflect results of interaction by individuals within the structure (microinteraction). The aggregate interaction will determine the character and dynamics of citizen participation activity.

---


5 Booher, op. cit., p. 99.
Macrointeraction, the total political, social, and economic milieu which functions in the community, determines how a participatory strategy is structured. How the structure responds to the larger community is determined by its microinteraction—the interaction of individuals characterized by who takes part in discussions, and how conflicts emerge and are resolved.6

Any act of social interaction can be viewed as a bargaining or exchange process. This process occurs at the individual level by the balancing of benefits and services on a one-to-one basis. At the community level, this balancing takes place between different interest groups and community-wide interests.7

The macrointeraction process results from meeting the needs of the policy formation system. Two forces affect exchange interaction at this level—ideological interests and organizational and electoral interests. Booher describes ideological interests as those "... relatively stable attitudes and behavior patterns of individuals in the political milieu toward the appropriateness of change in the elements of the political

6Ibid., pp. 95-98.

regime or in the relationship between classes and races." Organizational and electoral interests are represented by ". . . the positions various actors would take on issues based upon the importance of these issues for their own economic or political advantage." The combination of these two forces at a community level determines a community's receptiveness to the inclusion of new groups (a new set of interests) into the policy formation arena. Its place on a continuum ranging from open to closed describes a particular community's receptiveness to the inclusion of new groups.8

The exchange process at the microinteraction level is also affected by several forces—direct and indirect inducements balanced by individual contributions. An individual participating in a structure (group) has direct inducements for participation in ensuring that his (her) organization and/or ideological interests are reflected in the goals of the structure. Indirect inducements include those factors not dependent upon the goals of the structure, for example, personal prestige or recognition. Booher theorizes that ". . . participants who are motivated by indirect inducements not dependent upon the goals of the group are unlikely to expend the resources necessary

8Booher, op. cit., p. 135.
(contributions) to significantly influence those goals. On
the other hand, the individual motivated by direct inducements
is likely to terminate active involvement in the participatory
group if the goals to not reflect that person's personal
values and all attempts to influence goals fail."9 A
participatory structure can be typed as more or less
competitive or noncompetitive depending on the balance
between the quantity and type of inducements of each
individual and the quantity and type of contributions of
each individual.10

These two components affecting aggregate interaction
(macrointeraction and microinteraction) form the basis of a
typology of participatory structures. Booher hypothesizes
that any participatory structure could be classified as
either "... participatory, elite, coopting or ceremonial
according to the extent which it is open or closed, and
balanced or unbalanced.11 He describes this typology as
follows:

The typology suggests that a truly participatory
structure will emerge in only those situations
where the milieu created by macrointeraction
permits relatively open access by all members
of the community and where an equilibrium between
the inducements and contributions of all partici­
pants are balanced, but where the structure is
largely closed to all but those groups already

9Ibid., p. 120. 10Ibid., p. 135.
11Ibid.
exercising influence in the community, an elite structure will result. Competition may occur within the structure, but the structure will probably not include descriptive representation by all interests. On the other hand, structures which are relatively open to access by all groups but which do not reflect a balance of the individual inducements with contributions will be generally representative but noncompetitive (coopting). And finally, unbalanced structures in a relatively closed community will likely be largely noncompetitive and nonrepresentative (ceremonial).12

Applying the above theory to the activities (as described in Chapter III) of the Morningside Project Area Committee (PAC) allows an objective analysis of the level of power in decision-making which they achieved. The Morningside Community elected representatives to the PAC. From all the available data (based on interviews and observation), those elected were among the most articulate, educated, and therefore had the most resources to contribute to the citizen participation effort.

Shortly after PAC's formation, it was evident that the members agreed on the goal of obtaining what they thought as individuals was best for the whole community. Collectively, these goals included little or no clearance, rehabilitation, a relocation policy which worked, more community facilities, predominantly residential reuse with an emphasis on single-family dwellings, street improvements, and as little disruption in community life as possible. They

12Ibid., p. 129.
acted as those members of Congress who vote their own opinion, rather than always reflecting the majority opinion of their constituents. It is probable that the absence of effective communication skills among their constituents along with the emotional reactions towards urban renewal brought about by negative past experiences (Chapter III, part I) contributed to this situation.

Some PAC members were more clearly motivated by direct inducements such as protection of property interests. Others may have been more motivated by indirect inducements like community recognition. For the most part, at the beginning it was a combination of both types of inducements that motivated PAC members.

This combination of inducements was not always in balance. Those members who were predominantly motivated by direct inducements ceased contribution to the group when it became evident that PAC's goals included cooperation with KHA in planning for overall community needs. This set of goals was counter to their property interests.

The combination of inducements become more out of balance when the realization of the impact of the renewal plans upon Morningside becomes finalized. Attendance by PAC members at meetings was consistently lower. As a chance

---

for changing the plan diminished, direct inducements for continued participation and contribution to PAC declined. PAC became less competitive because those members primarily motivated by indirect inducements to participation were not balanced by those primarily motivated by direct inducements.

Summarizing this change, the PAC was formed by an election in which all Morningside community residents could participate. Theoretically, accessibility was open to all interests within the community. Individual inducements were balanced with potential contributions. PAC was only elite in the sense that those elected possessed more of the skills needed for successful participation than most Morningside residents.

As the participatory process unfolded over time, the effects of the events occurring at the macrointeraction level caused a shift in the balance between inducements and contributions and in essence also lessened the degree of PAC's representativeness. The competition between inducements to participation lessened along with contributions to positive group activity. The membership became nonrepresentative in the sense that those members opposed to the plan sought to make input at the macrointeraction level (City Council) after having failed at the microinteraction level (PAC). These members were consistently outvoted and those measures for the good of the community as determined by majority vote,
prevailed over personal interests. PAC lost representativeness in that it could not bring back into balance community goals with the goals of that segment of the Morningside population which was motivated solely by direct inducements. The participatory structure of PAC changed from one resembling a true participatory structure to one more closely resembling a ceremonial structure.

In terms of analyzing the level of power in decision-making it is important to examine the macrointeraction level of activity—the actions of the Knoxville City Council and KHA in relationship to the Morningside Urban Renewal Project. Knoxville City Council can be described, using the same typology, as an elite participatory structure—inducements and contributions are balanced, but the structure is largely closed to all but those groups already exercising influence in the community. Competition occurs within City Council, but it does not include descriptive representation by all interests (for example, university students). KHA commissioners are appointed and therefore represent the interests of the mayor and city council. KHA was prompted to set up the PAC in order to receive federal monies for the project. The success of the participatory structure in Morningside and City Council's approval of this activity was thought to influence the obtainment of future federal dollars for other urban renewal projects (Fort Sanders, for
example). Thus, the elite participatory structure of City Council came under pressure to include in its deliberations a group that heretofore had not had significant representation.

At the same time, KHA had to come to grips with the reality of citizen participation in its planning efforts. At the management level, this pressure created a change in attitudes resulting from a change in leadership. The, then, new director was for citizen participation but realized the difficulties in reaching compatibility between overall community goals and the goals as perceived by Morningside community residents. This disparity was related to differences in background. He visualized that the Fort Sander's PAC would have from KHA's (macrointeraction) terms a more effective input because the resident's backgrounds (resources) were different.

KHA's relationship with the Morningside PAC can be described as one of limited partnership. This is evidenced by several events which occurred during the planning and survey period. Even though PAC members had goals for their neighborhood's redevelopment, the actual working relationship was one of KHA developing a set of goals and PAC accepting or rejecting these goals based on how they perceived

---

14 Chuck Boyd, personal interview at his office, Knoxville, Tennessee, October, 1970.

neighborhood resident's opinions. Then, KHA and PAC would take these goals to neighborhood meetings for discussion. This relationship can be described as one developing from the top down to neighborhood residents, rather than from the bottom up with PAC as the vehicle of communication between residents and KHA. KHA made no effort to involve the committees formed by PAC in primary planning efforts (the rehabilitation committee, for example). Only on the issue of rectifying the structural survey information, can it be said that a true partnership existed. In short, the procedure was for KHA to do the planning and the citizen participation input was to modify the plans as proposed.

On the surface, because of the pressure exerted on it so that Knoxville could receive future federal urban renewal monies, City Council expanded its degree of representativeness. Council appeared to be more open or accessible in that it approved the Morningside Urban Renewal Plan—a plan modified by a group of interests not usually taken into consideration. However, this increased accessibility was limited. When an issue arose that could have reinforced the citizen participatory structure at the microinteraction level (the widening of Dandridge Avenue controversy), the macrointeraction level of decision-making did not retain the openness (representativeness) it superficially appeared to have gained. The process of
aggregate interaction reduced the level of decision-making that the microinteraction process (PAC) had achieved with KHA, one of limited partnership, to one that could only be described as purely advisory. In real terms, what occurred was that segment of the PAC which was primarily motivated by direct inducements was able to circumvent the citizen participation process by appealing to City Council on the basis of past relationships, thereby weakening the position of the citizen participation strategy.

There is some question as to whether City Council (macrointeraction) was truly in favor of broadening its representativeness (accessibility) through the citizen participation process (microinteraction). "City Council has screamed citizen participation in urban renewal, but look at the Task Force for the Mountain View Downtown Redevelopment—that is not citizen participation. Only two city council members voted against it."\(^{16}\) Knoxville's City Council can still be described as resembling an elite participatory structure.

III. APPLICATION OF THE MORNSIDE EXPERIENCE TO FUTURE URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS IN KNOXVILLE

Since the beginning of the planning profession, citizen participation in decision-making has been a concern.

\(^{16}\)Ibid.
When the first city planning commissions were established (Hartford, 1907; Milwaukee, 1908; Chicago, 1909), planning functions became a public responsibility, even though public involvement was limited to those that could be described as influential civic leaders. 17

Sidney Verba defines political participation as "... those activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take." 18 The purpose of this process is to influence policies, not to execute them. At a national scale, it is an upward flow of influence, not to support current policy, but to help formulate future national interest. Public participation in government is important for three reasons: (1) it lies at the core of democratic theory and democratic policy formation in the United States; (2) it is a process of goal formulation which attempts to maximize the allocation of benefits to needs through the selection of priorities; and (3) it reinforces the citizens role of responsibility at the individual level. 19 In their study of Participation in American


18Verba and Nie, op. cit., p. 2.

19Ibid., pp. 3-5.
Political Democracy and Social Equality, Verba and Nie concluded that there is a close relationship between social status, participation, and governmental responsiveness in American politics. Based upon the past urban renewal experiences, including the Morningside experiences, it can be said that Knoxville's history of citizen participation efforts followed the character of the national participation scenario. The system is a relatively closed one which is not readily accessible to those without the necessary resources to participate, including status.

Greenstone and Peterson outline four authority structures which govern the relationship between government leaders and citizens in the United States. They are as follows:

I. democratic participation in the selection of rulers;
II. pluralist bargaining among institutionalized interests; i.e., deference to vested groups in the formulation of policy;
III. adherence to instrumentally rationalized norms in governmental administration (due process); and
IV. constitutionalism, the safe guarding of fundamental liberties.

These structures of authority pattern an orientation and behavior system. The orientation is that set of principles which shape the relationship between citizens and government;

while the behavior system is that set of practices which conform to those principles.21

Pluralist bargaining is a process which does not preserve the status quo but which can have the impact of slowing the rate of change. Another term defining the pluralist bargaining structure is incrementalism. Government does not consider all of the potential alternatives or value questions, but modifies an existing situation through policies aimed at creating a small amount of change (marginal) over time. Since incrementalism is not related to any factional interest, it has been termed as "rational action in the public interest." This process of incrementalism reduces the number of options that needs to be considered to a manageable level so that rational action is feasible. Through the process of compromise, government is concurrently considering the broad range of values that relate to a policy decision.22

If more scientific knowledge was available on the impact of


a decision, incremental changes could conceivably be on a larger scale.

Some of the problems experienced during the Morningside Urban Renewal Planning and Survey period point to suggestions for future urban renewal citizen participation structures in Knoxville. These changes are incremental in nature and can result in rational action in the public interest, considering the forces shaping the aggregate level of interaction operating on a citizen participation strategy. The potential result of these suggestions is to enhance the possibility of a more productive citizen participation structure—to improve the conditions of microinteraction, and to increase macrointeraction representativeness, consequently altering the level of aggregate interaction shaping a citizen participation strategy.

When a proposed urban renewal project is in the discussion phase, it would be to the city's advantage to seek out grass-roots neighborhood opinions. This step could include measures to encourage neighborhood interest in participating (citizenship education); a series of neighborhood meetings; and the formation, by the potentially affected residents, of a representative citizen participation structure. In order to be successful, this has to be done early in the planning period so that the time-lag does not produce the set of negative circumstances to participation
(reaction to a plan that was already essentially proposed and not understood) which occurred in Morningside.

The citizen's participation structure should be viewed as a vehicle of communication from the residents to the agency having the planning responsibility. This structure would have the function of formulating proposals after a period of goal formulation activities by the residents. This function requires that the structure have financial and talent resources from which to draw. It is within the current urban renewal guidelines (Urban Renewal Handbook, Chapter I) that it is the responsibility of the local public agency to provide these resources to the citizen participation structure. KHA did not make these resources available to the Morningside PAC, probably partially due to the timing of events—PAC was asked to support a planning proposal barely two months after its formation.

One of the problems experienced in Morningside was the lack of a vehicle of communication from the PAC back to neighborhood residents. From the Morningside experience, it cannot be assumed by the fact that each PAC member represented a neighborhood unit that the members had the time or resources to devote to this type of communication. Attending meetings is a time consuming responsibility when you also have other economic and social obligations. Only one newsletter was published and distributed. If this had
been done on a regular basis with widespread distribution along with other media coverage, perhaps communication between the PAC and neighborhood residents would have been more fruitful. The resources necessary to produce this communication effort seem well within the responsibility of the local public agency as defined by HUD guidelines in its *Urban Renewal Handbook*.

The responsibility of providing an agenda for citizen participation meetings depends upon the group calling the meeting. The important thing is that the agenda be well-defined and the purpose of the meeting fully explained. Crenson, from his research on organizational factors in citizen participation, has hypothesized that ill-defined agendas result in internal conflict and the lack of proposals resulting from few demands. His observation of community groups suggests that the following pattern results:

... when an organization is not preoccupied with important business, its members have an opportunity to complain about all those grievances, real or imagined, that they have been nurturing in private against the organization and its members. The lack of a full agenda may also contribute to dissension in a group by causing the members to pay an inordinate amount of attention to organizational housekeeping and internal management. ... Because preoccupation with procedure seems to call attention to the distribution of authority and status within the organization, group members develop a special sensitivity to their standing among their colleagues. ... Uncertainty about an organization's agenda, as well as the combination of friendship and organizational activism, is
related to the frequency of complaint about internal conflict; ... and ... the frequency of these complaints is also associated with the failure to produce political demands.23

There is no evidence in the minutes of the PAC or in any of those meetings held by KHA with neighborhood residents that a structured agenda gave organization or purpose to the meeting. Discussion rambled from subject to subject with the result that specific group decisions did not seem to relate to a specified framework of discussion. Several incidents pointed to a degree of internal conflict; for example, the chairman's offer of resignation, repeated questioning of how members voted, the emphasis of discussion on past urban renewal problems, and the repetition of topics already discussed at length.

Another suggestion can be made, one that relates to the macrointeraction level. The agency responsible for a citizen participation effort, whether in urban renewal or other planning functions, can encourage the appropriate city council member(s) to attend citizen participation structure meetings. The purpose of council attendance is not to become an active member of the group (which could conflict with his role as community decision maker) but to listen, learn, and gain a rapport with his constituents and their problems. This effort could bring closer together the

---

macrointeraction level of decision making with those groups that perceive their relationship with city council on an adversary basis. This politicization of those in power by those trying to make an input into governmental policy has the potential for making the system more open and, consequently, more representative. Community leaders can be enticed into this proposed relationship by the offering of indirect inducements to attend meetings such as favorable publicity, the opportunity to communicate with constituents, and even such considerations as increasing the politician's chances of reelection.

A final lesson can be learned from the Morningside experience. Planners at the local level are no longer dealing with those citizen's groups composed of influential citizens whose level of participation is enhanced by education, status, organizational experience and all those factors which make their positions easily verbalized. Because of federal legislation and accompanying guidelines, the door has been opened to those who previously have not been heard or intentionally left out of the decision-making process. As a profession relying on a variety of skills, planning needs to develop new techniques for listening and incorporating into policy statements and physical plans the needs of those who, because of a lack of resources from which to draw, find it difficult to relate what they perceive
as their personal needs to overall community objectives. Each planning situation will be different as each set of citizens whose interests come into play will vary depending on location, social composition, and planning purpose. Techniques successful in one situation may or may not have the same degree of success in another. In order for the profession to expand its skills, planners will have to seek out exposure to a variety of groups and learn to listen and accurately interpret their methods of expression.
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January 11, 1971

Mrs. Allen W. Hogan
2521 Kingston Park, Apt. 212
Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

Dear Mrs. Hogan:

We are pleased to provide you with the available information concerning citizen participation in the urban renewal process and its application in the Morningside Urban Renewal Area of Knoxville which you requested in your letter of December 28, 1970, to us.

Citizen participation requirements for urban renewal projects arise from our administrative guidelines rather than from specific legislative mandate. These requirements arose from and are patterned somewhat after the general incentives for citizen participation in all socially-directed Federally-assisted programs, as inspired by the Economic Development Act of 1964 and similar legislation. We have enclosed a copy of our Urban Renewal Handbook requirements for citizen participation and the most recent memorandum from our Washington office affecting those requirements. We have also enclosed a packet used by our office in training programs for personnel in local public agencies engaged in social services and citizen participation work.

The Morningside Urban Renewal Area in Knoxville does have an active Project Area Committee. We suggest that you get in touch with Mr. F. Rodney Lawler, Executive Director of the Knoxville Housing Authority, Inc., for information concerning citizen participation activities in that project. We are sure that Mr. Lawler and his staff will assist you in every possible way. You may get in touch with them at 901 Broadway, N. E., or by telephone at 546-1560, extension 201.

We appreciate your interest in our programs and hope that this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Edmunds
Assistant Regional Administrator for Renewal Assistance
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