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In March 2015, the City of Peoria requested assistance from the National Resource Network (the Network) in developing a commercial corridor plan for Western Avenue in a region of Southern Peoria known as the Southside. The City wanted to revitalize the area by attracting jobs, increasing retail access for residents, and eventually attracting mixed-income development. The Southside, once a stable and diverse working class community, has suffered from a significant loss of population and an increasing concentration of poverty. After an assessment visit, the Network determined that the generational poverty present in the Southside first needed to be acknowledged and addressed in order for a commercial corridor plan to be successful. Under a revised scope of work, the Network provided direct technical assistance to help City leaders, business leaders and community stakeholders understand the historical and projected demographic trends in the Southside, compare access to opportunity for residents of the Southside with other parts of the City, and consider the implications for Peoria if conditions are allowed to continue, making the case for a concerted and collaborative neighborhood-based effort to improve conditions.

The Network provided technical assistance to the City from February through July 2016, culminating in a final presentation on July 11–12, 2016, which included guest speaker Paul Schmitz of FSG. The City was an enthusiastic partner throughout the engagement, helping to collect data and coordinate site visits. The Network analyzed qualitative and quantitative data, consulted existing studies and reports, performed regression analyses to identify relationships between poverty and various socioeconomic indicators, created projection models to forecast poverty trends, and investigated disparate access to opportunity among residents within the City.

Throughout the engagement, the Network endeavored to validate, complement and contextualize quantitative data through local expertise. During four site visits to Peoria, the Network met with numerous stakeholders, community leaders, faith leaders, City staff, political officials, service-providers and Southside residents. Collaboration with key anchor institutions and community leaders ensured proper consideration of local political dynamics, regional trends and community history. The insight and observations received through stakeholder interviews greatly influenced the content presented in July and informed the development of the following findings.

The data analysis illustrated that concentrated poverty in the Southside is severe, has risen over the last four decades and is projected to increase. In addition, poverty has now

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“I would encourage you to keep in mind all those people around us who are trapped in a cycle of poverty. They too need to be given hope. The fight against poverty and hunger must be fought constantly and on many fronts, especially in its causes.”

—Pope Francis in remarks to Congress
September 2015
spread beyond the Southside and is likely to continue spreading. Access to opportunity and economic mobility is limited for residents compared with other parts of Peoria. Low educational outcomes for adult residents, higher rates of unemployment, lack of adequate transportation options, poorly performing schools and inadequate access to recreational opportunities for youth are indicative that the cycle of poverty is a significant challenge and is increasingly impacting adjacent communities.

The “cycle of poverty” has been defined as a phenomenon in which individuals continue to experience poverty for at least three generations. It became apparent to the Network through interactions with residents and stakeholders that there was diminishing hope in residents’ ability to access opportunity and break the cycle of generational poverty.

Pope Francis asserted to Congress in 2015 that those born into a cycle of poverty need to be given hope, and he urged U.S. political leaders to diligently pursue the causes of poverty and hunger. In Peoria, the siloed, programmatic approach is only addressing the symptoms of poverty.

Individual organizations may be able to implement programs that address technical problems, problems that are simple and linear, for which solutions are known in advance and progress does not require cross-sector collaboration. Unfortunately, the complexity and cyclical nature of poverty in the Southside constitutes an adaptive problem in which an integrated set of solutions must be coordinated in order for progress to occur. Adaptive problems are neither simple nor linear and require collaboration among organizations and across sectors to coordinate efforts in order to have a collective impact.

There are a number of organizations dedicated to improving conditions in the Southside and to restoring hope to residents, especially youth. However, in conversations with stakeholders, the Network observed that organizations and agencies across Peoria struggle to connect and to collaborate, both within and across sectors. In addition, existing collaborative efforts often have overlapping goals and geographic focus areas but may not communicate sufficiently, missing opportunities to build on and leverage each other's efforts. Furthermore, social service providers in the Southside are competing for limited funds and not currently incentivized to collaborate. Recent progress has been made in this area, such as Alignment Peoria, which targets improved and coordinated educational outcomes.

Lack of consensus around the importance of the Southside to the City and the region’s economic wellbeing also emerged as an issue. In response to this observation, the Network pursued a hypothesis that the concentration of poverty should be a concern for all Peorians, not just those living or working in the Southside. A renewed and united effort on improving conditions would likely reduce direct and indirect poverty-associated costs and lead to positive spillover effects for the City and the Greater Peoria region.

Not only does the concentration of poverty create an economic burden, but a continuous
cycle of poverty also results in lost opportunity and hope. By allowing the current conditions to persist, Peoria may be missing out on the potential contributions of the Southside’s assets, including its young people, entrepreneurs, small businesses and neighborhood advocates.

Given the pressing socioeconomic and equity concerns identified by these findings, the Network recommends the City undertake a process to develop a shared vision for the Southside that will unite and align the City, stakeholders’ and residents’ efforts and guide incremental steps toward progress. The solutions for the Southside exist within Peoria – but a structured framework may facilitate the development of that shared vision and provide increased accountability for its implementation.

The Network proposes that Peoria explore a structured collaboration model known as ‘Collective Impact.’ This approach, popularized by a series of articles in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* starting in 2011, has found success in other cities addressing complex social challenges too large for any one organization to resolve. This framework may be utilized to organize a long-term collaborative effort to improve outcomes by focusing on one particular social challenge that the community chooses.

The Network suggests the City undertake the following actions:

• **Continued Demonstration of the Southside as a Priority Area.** Take specific, concrete actions to continue to demonstrate the City’s commitment to improve conditions and communicate these efforts widely. Leading by example, the City’s increased attention to the Southside and efforts to lift up progress will begin to change the narrative and contribute to building momentum. Anchor institutions are more likely to invest substantially and differently if the City invests in improved infrastructure and services. Private development is likely to follow, especially if incentivized through targeted tax increment financing (TIF) and other programs.

• **Increased Community Engagement to Explore the Collective Impact Framework.** Establish and maintain a platform for community residents, neighborhood leaders, stakeholders, anchor institutions, service-providers, philanthropy and City agencies to convene and discuss collaborative efforts and the Collective Impact model. Facilitate conversations that lift up diverse voices, with a special effort to engage or cultivate leadership among historically excluded populations. Explore internally and within a working group if conditions in Peoria are currently conducive to successful implementation of Collective Impact, or if not, what actions must be taken to increase readiness.

• **Establishment of a Steering Committee.** When pre-conditions for Collective Impact are in place, support the establishment of a representative Steering Committee to launch a new structured collaboration targeting the Southside. The Steering Committee, supported by a backbone organization, will undergo a process to establish a shared vocabulary and baseline understanding of the Southside’s challenges and opportunities at a systems-level; gain agreement on core challenges and a vision for change; identify key indicators to measure
progress; and set a common agenda.

The Network looks forward to supporting the City of Peoria in the future with peer learning opportunities, the 311 for Cities program and via resources on the Network’s TA Clearinghouse.
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The City of Peoria applied for assistance from the National Resource Network in March 2015 for support in developing a commercial corridor plan for a section of Western Avenue in Southern Peoria, in a community known as the Southside.

Formerly a bustling retail corridor, Western Avenue has struggled with high commercial vacancy amid a declining population and increasing concentration of poverty. Until recently, residents lacked a full-service grocery store within the neighborhood and were forced to leave the community to access even the most basic retail and services.

The National Resource Network conducted a site visit to the City of Peoria on June 4–5, 2015, to perform an assessment and develop a proposed scope of work. The assessment process included data collection and analysis, interviews with key leadership and development of a 50+ page Assessment Report.

Based on the assessment, the Network advised the City to comprehensively address the ongoing population loss in the neighborhood, lack of opportunity for residents, and disinvestment in the community, before developing a commercial corridor plan.

After a revision to the scope, City Council approved the Memorandum of Understanding on January 28, 2016, and the engagement commenced in early February. The Network collected qualitative and quantitative data, performed regression analyses to identify relationships between poverty and various socioeconomic indicators, created projection models to forecast poverty trends and investigated disparate access to opportunity among residents of different areas in the City, culminating in a final presentation on July 11–12, 2016. The first day of the final presentation focused on the data analysis findings and provided an opportunity for participants to discuss implications. The second day featured guest speaker Paul Schmitz from FSG for a highly interactive introductory session about Collective Impact, focusing particularly on the cultural shifts needed for a structured collaboration model to be successful in Peoria.

The Network also collected qualitative data and feedback from diverse community stakeholders during four site visits, meeting with resident leaders, faith leaders, City staff, political officials, service-providers and Southside residents. Several influential Southside champions were pivotal to the process, connecting the Network with community leadership, youth, residents, and providing local context as the Network interpreted its analyses. The City’s partnership also proved invaluable, providing the Network with access to key anchor leadership and ensuring proper consideration of local political dynamics and regional trends. The insight and observations obtained through stakeholder interviews greatly influenced the content presented in July and informed the development of the findings and recommendations provided in this report.
Some residents consider the Southside to be the heart of Peoria because it contains the city’s original boundaries from 1825 and is the childhood home of many influential Peorians. Unfortunately, over the past four decades, this part of Peoria has become increasingly impoverished.

Urban renewal efforts by the City in the 1960s to reduce blight had the unintended consequence of displacing hundreds of Black homeowners and disrupting the Southside’s social fabric. National economic trends and the transition away from a manufacturing-based economy resulted in the relocation of working class families as factories along the Illinois River closed down. Major employer Caterpillar Inc. decreased their dependence on the local workforce as technology developed to replace low-skilled workers. As the economy has shifted in Peoria, Southside residents have been increasingly unable to find well-paid employment. In addition, preferences for suburban-style housing and increasing availability of newly developed housing in northern Peoria also contributed to the out-migration of many of the Southside’s middle-class families. By the end of the century, most families with financial resources had voluntarily left the Southside.

Figure 1. Comparison of average family income, Peoria, IL (1970–2014)
The declining population resulted in higher residential and commercial vacancy rates, which had a detrimental effect on home prices. Although previously a community in which most families owned their home, the Southside is now primarily renter households, many of which live in substandard housing owned by absentee landlords. A recent study of the South Village TIF area found that 71 percent of buildings were deteriorated and 13 percent of buildings and 25 percent of parcels were vacant.

Figure 1 shows that in 2014 the average South Peorian family’s income was less than half the average income for families in the rest of the City. The long-term trend indicates that the income gap between families in the Southside and the rest of the City continues to widen.

The concentration of non-White residents has also significantly increased in the Southside over the past 30 years. As Figure 2 depicts, between 1980 and 2014, the number of White residents in the Southside dropped by nearly 70 percent, while in the rest of Peoria the number of White residents decreased by only about 30 percent. Local stakeholders explained that as White and higher income Black families left the Southside, they left behind the elderly, veterans, and the most vulnerable families, increasing the concentration of poverty as a result.

This out-migration has resulted in both an increasing concentration and spread of poverty. As higher income families in adjacent communities have moved further north, moderate-income families in the Southside have relocated to formerly middle-class areas such as East and West Bluff, to take advantage of increasingly available affordable housing options. As a result, over the past 40 years, the number of people in high poverty areas has increased significantly. In 1970, more than 21,500 Peoria residents lived in a neighborhood that could be classified as a high-poverty area (where over 20 percent of residents lived below the poverty line). By 2014, that number had increased to more than 46,000. Of those, more than 18,000 residents lived in neighborhoods with a poverty rate exceeding 40 percent (see Figures 3 and 4). This level of concentration is among the highest observed across the country.\(^1\)

Figure 2. Racial demographics, Peoria, IL (1980–2014)
Based on the Network’s projection analysis, this trend is expected to continue, both in the Southside and in the rest of the City. Even with a conservative projection that uses a two-person household as the poverty threshold, by 2020, 42 percent of households in the Southside and 12 percent of households in the rest of Peoria will fall below the poverty line (see Figure 5).

Researchers have found that when neighborhoods reach a certain “tipping point” (high poverty rates above 20 percent), they experience lower property values, higher crime rates and fewer employment opportunities. In Peoria, these conditions affect 28,000 residents who are above the poverty line but who live in high poverty neighborhoods (see Figure 6).

Neighborhoods with high poverty often lack access to opportunity. The Kirwan Institute defines opportunity as “a situation or condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel.” Increasing access to opportunity provides improved
chances for children living in neighborhoods of high poverty to move up the socioeconomic ladder as adults. Enterprise Community Partners is currently developing the Communities of Opportunity Index (COI), which will depict access to opportunity across five dimensions: 1) Resident Housing Security; 2) Housing Market Condition; 3) Resident Connection to Transit; 4) Economic Mobility and Inclusion; and 5) Resident Health and Wellness. The Index is still in development, but to support this engagement the Network utilized a prototype of it to inform findings in Peoria.

The prototype used a subset of indicators from the larger group of metrics which will be part of the final COI product. The COI provided insight into disparities in access to opportunity across geographic areas of Peoria. As shown in the opportunity dials in Figure 7, compared to the rest of the City, residents in the Southside lack access to quality housing, jobs, healthcare and other opportunities. For instance, relative to the rest of the city, the housing market conditions in the Southside are very weak. Out of the seven census tracts that define the Southside neighborhood, most of them have low median home values, high vacancy, and a low number of home loan originations. A detailed report with an opportunity dial for each census tract is included in the appendices.

Fortunately, a number of Southside leaders and advocates fully understand the complex challenges facing the Southside and have dedicated their lives to improve conditions. The Network met with several committed, passionate leaders from the nonprofit sector. Recent developments, initiatives and successes have sparked renewed hope among some residents for improved conditions. The investment of Caterpillar in LISC, expected $200 million combined sewer overflow (CSO) project, new tool lending library and new Save-A-Lot store

Figure 4. Change in high and extreme poverty, Peoria, IL (1970–2014)
are helping to build momentum. New and stronger partnerships have also benefitted the community, such as with the local newspaper The Journal Star, which committed to write an article series portraying the Southside in a more positive light.

Recent and emerging collaborative initiatives in Peoria have capitalized on increasing momentum, including Alignment Peoria, Don’t Shoot, the Maternal/Child Health Collaborative and more regional efforts by the Economic Development Council. As described by one Southside advocate, there is currently a window of opportunity for transformative change to occur.

This trend toward collaboration is an encouraging start. Poverty and inequitable access to opportunity are complex, adaptive problems, to which no single organization, or perhaps even sector, can make a transformational impact. Unfortunately, the Network observed that many organizations and agencies across Peoria still struggle to connect and to collaborate, both within and across sectors. In addition, existing collaborative efforts often

---

**Figure 5. Projected poverty through 2020, Peoria, IL**
have overlapping goals and geographic focus areas but may not communicate sufficiently, missing opportunities to build on and leverage each other’s efforts. Social service providers in the Southside also compete for limited funds and are not currently incentivized to collaborate.

Another challenge the Network encountered was a lack of consensus around the importance of the Southside to the broader City and to the region's economic wellbeing. In response to this observation, the Network pursued a hypothesis that the concentration of poverty should be a concern for all Peorians, not just those living or working in the Southside. The Network found that a renewed and united effort on improving conditions in the Southside would likely reduce direct and indirect poverty-associated costs and lead to positive spillover effects for the City and the Greater Peoria region. Joassart-Marcelli's research found that as poverty in a city increases it adds additional fiscal strain onto cities, forcing Cities to either cut services or raise taxes and fees, leading to further exurbanization of wealthier residents and reinforcing concentrated poverty. Studies also show the negative impact of concentrated poverty on the metropolitan level as well.3

There are also implications for accessing federal funds that benefit the entire city such as the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). According to HUD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Rule, the Southside of Peoria is classified as a racially concentrated area of poverty (R/CAP) (see Figure 8).4 Peoria will be required to complete an Assessment of Fair Housing in April 2018. As part of that process, Peoria will need to identify fair housing issues facing the

jurisdiction and region, identify and prioritize factors that have significantly contributed to these issues, and set fair housing goals and priorities that will inform the strategies and actions contained in Peoria's future plans. One of the fair housing issues that Peoria will need to address is racially and/or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty such as the Southside.

A continuous cycle of poverty also results in lost opportunity and hope. By allowing the current conditions to persist, Peoria may be missing out on the potential contributions of the Southside's assets, including its young people, entrepreneurs, small businesses and neighborhood advocates. Research has consistently shown that place matters – the zip code that a child grows up in has a significant correlation with that child's outcomes as an adult. Multiple studies have shown that poverty has negative impacts on a child's ability to learn in a number of ways. One study found that children living in poverty hear 30 million fewer words by age three than higher income children. Growing up with the chronic stress of poverty impacts the ability of children to develop cognitively. A recent study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) of Pediatrics found that living in poverty had a direct impact on the brain development of children – they found that the regions of the brain linked to learning and memory and emotional functioning were smaller in poor children compared to children who were not poor. Peoria and the region as a whole will be stronger when the potential talent and contributions of all of Peoria's children are fully realized.

Figure 7. Comparing opportunity, Peoria, IL
Figure 8. R/CAP boundaries, Peoria, IL.
Given the pressing socioeconomic and equity concerns identified by these findings, the Network hopes the City will undertake a process to develop a shared vision for the Southside that will unite and align stakeholders and residents and guide incremental steps towards progress. The solutions for the Southside exist within Peoria – but a structured framework may facilitate the development of that shared vision and provide increased accountability for its implementation.
COLLECTIVE IMPACT

COLLECTIVE IMPACT: A FRAMEWORK FOR STRUCTURED COLLABORATION

Collective Impact is a structured collaboration framework popularized by a series of articles in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* starting in 2011. As described by the framework’s architects John Kania and Mark Kramer, the model is best suited to address complex, adaptive social problems. Adaptive problems are those problems for which the answer is not known, problems that are actively changing, and problems for which no single entity can implement a solution. To resolve adaptive problems, a new, more systematic approach to collaboration is necessary which changes the way that different entities and sectors come together to solve a common problem. Since 2011, John Kania and Mark Kramer, and their firm – FSG – have researched and refined the model and assisted communities around the country to set up collaborations. Although relatively new, this approach has already been successful in other cities struggling with complex social challenges too large for any one organization to resolve.

The Network introduced this framework to a diverse group of stakeholders and residents on July 12, 2016, through an interactive presentation delivered by FSG’s Paul Schmitz. Participants included leadership from key anchor institutions, the school system, service providers, faith leaders, community residents, high school students and staff from several city agencies. Paul’s presentation introduced the model, challenged assumptions about the nature of collaboration and used table-based discussion to explore key concepts critical for successful collaboration.

Paul emphasized that Collective Impact is not just a program, but rather a process to align existing efforts and better target resources to solve a specific social challenge. Through this structured collaborative process, communities should achieve greater progress than working in isolated silos. Collective Impact initiatives vary greatly in organization and mission, but successful Collective Impact partnerships include the following five elements:

1. **A common agenda for change**, including a shared understanding of the problem and what approach will be used to solve it.

2. **Shared measurement systems** for the initiative’s progress. Consistent data collection and reporting ensures that all efforts remain aligned and allows participating organizations to hold each other accountable.

3. **Mutually reinforcing activities** that capitalize on each organization’s strengths and simultaneously address different facets of the problem.

4. **Continuous communication** between participants to develop trust, create a common vocabulary, and learn from one another.

5. **A backbone support organization** that provides a dedicated staff, separate from the participating organizations, to coordinate all phases of the initiative. Some initiatives choose to identify multiple backbone support organizations that take responsibility for progress in different issue areas.
Communities must have some basic readiness in order for the model to be successful. The four factors of community readiness are as follows:

1. Credible champions and neutral conveners
2. A shared sense of urgency that more or better status quo won’t solve the problem
3. Significant resources/attention, public and private funders willing to collaborate
4. Trust among the diverse leaders and stakeholders necessary to solve the problem

During Paul’s presentation, participants discussed in small groups which readiness factors are already strong in Peoria and which factors need strengthening. Discussion among individuals with a common interest in the Southside, but who do not typically work together, demonstrated the importance of bringing diverse perspectives and sectors together, a guiding principle of the Collective Impact model. The groups were well-mixed to ensure each table had representatives from different sectors and a combination of community residents and leaders along with professionals and stakeholders. The diversity of attendees also modeled inclusion – another guiding principle of the model – by including residents in the discussion alongside City leadership, business owners and influential individuals.

Through this exercise, it became clear that Peoria is fortunate to have a great deal of non-profits, engaged anchor institutions, passionate resident leaders, tireless City servants and a number of existing and developing collaborations. There are a dozens of non-profits and community groups working diligently to improve outcomes for vulnerable children and families in neighborhoods across the City. Recognizing the siloed nature of their work, there has been an increasing push for collaborative work in Peoria. However, the complexity of conditions on the Southside has posed a challenge for those dedicated to improving conditions.

Paul’s presentation clarified how the Collective Impact model may be helpful as a new approach to collaboration, a more inclusive process that may challenge the old way of doing business. After introducing the model and the components of readiness, Paul’s presentation focused on three core messages: 1) leadership; 2) community engagement; and 3) trust.

Paul Schmitz focused a majority of his presentation on the importance of culture, quoting Peter Drucker’s famous line that “Culture eats strategy for breakfast.” He asked participants to discuss among themselves the culture of leadership in Peoria by reflecting on their own experience as leaders in the community. Paul emphasized that leadership is an action, not a position that only few may hold. Leadership means taking responsibility to work together with others to advance common goals. He also expressed the importance of shared values that engage the commitment of other participants in an effort. The values Paul focused on
were asset-based thinking, diversity and inclusion, collaboration, continuous learning and integrity.

These shared values provide space for trust to develop and guide the productive involvement of a diverse group of actors. For example, the value of diversity and inclusion requires that any collaboration targeting a neighborhood must include community leaders at varying levels of influence. Paul recounted the familiar story of Rosa Parks, but shared about the broader context and other influential community leaders involved in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Although the story of Rosa Parks is commonly thought to be an example of one woman’s impulsive decision to stand up against injustice, she was actually the fourth woman to refuse to give up her seat to a White man on a public bus in Montgomery County, Alabama. Her action was part of a larger network of coexisting efforts happening simultaneously in Montgomery County, led by a number of individuals (see Figure 9). Although history often identifies a leader to be the face of change in retrospect, movements in reality are advanced by collective efforts of a number of actors over time. This story illustrated the importance of meaningful engagement of community leadership.

Figure 9. Civil rights leaders as an example of Collective Impact
Collective Impact requires the meaningful engagement of the targeted community to be successful. Paul shared a helpful graphic, depicted in Figure 10, to illustrate the varying levels of community engagement. Too often well-intended community engagement efforts fail to result in meaningful community involvement in the decision-making process. Accommodations must be made to facilitate the involvement of residents and community leaders. Paul emphasized that, in order to build trust with community residents, organizers must fulfill promises and build capacity, and work diligently to bring diverse perspectives to the discussion. Some considerations about what type of diversity is needed should include issue experience, demographic relevance, direct engagement and geographic association.

Lastly, Paul invited participants to actively cultivate a learning culture in Peoria – both within their organizations and as individuals. A learning culture means that individuals and institutions must be willing to acknowledge failure, learn from their own and others’ mistakes, address weaknesses and pursue opportunities for growth. He emphasized that a community must be willing to change to see transformation occur. Paul incorporated this value into the presentation by sharing a long list of his own shortcomings, inviting participants to share honestly with one another their areas for growth. This exercise demonstrated the power of building trust through honesty and vulnerability. In his final words to the audience, he encouraged everyone who attended to lead together to create an inclusive, collaborative culture that fosters community engagement, learning and accountability for shared results.

Before departing, he recommended attendees visit the Collective Impact Forum for
additional resources, and to learn about other communities that are using the model. Below are some examples of how the model has been used in other communities to address complex, adaptive social challenges. These examples provide a more substantive picture of what Collective Impact can look like in action.

- **Shared Prosperity Philadelphia** is a Collective Impact framework that the City of Philadelphia is using to implement the City’s anti-poverty agenda. It brings together public and private organizations, including the City and School District of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Office of Child Development and Early Learning, child care providers, business leaders, funders, technical support agencies, advocates and parents. Activities are coordinated through a city-wide public–private entity that is designed to continue, regardless of changes in city leadership. The framework’s overarching goals are to 1) focus job creation and workforce development efforts on adults with the greatest barriers to employment; 2) expand access to public benefits and essential services; 3) ensure that children enter school prepared to learn and expand opportunities for year-round learning; 4) increase housing security and affordability; and 5) strengthen economic security and asset-building. In 2015, the second year of this initiative, Shared Prosperity Philadelphia fully met or exceeded 23 of its target goals, with 15 remaining in progress.

- **Memphis Fast Forward** is an initiative formed in 2005 to increase economic prosperity and quality of life in the Greater Memphis area. Overseen by a 20-person steering committee of elected and business leaders, five backbone organizations and their partners work collaboratively to implement the initiative’s plan. As of 2013, Memphis Fast Forward has made significant accomplishments in public school reform, regional economic development, public safety, and government fiscal strength. In the face of the great recession, the initiative was able to spur the creation of more than 17,000 new jobs and generate new capital investments totaling more than $4 billion. Through three different mayoral administrations, another backbone organization worked to amplify government impact and efficiency, saving the City $75 million. Public school reforms supported by the initiative have resulted in a 50 percent increase in the number of students in pre-K and expanded high-potential teacher candidates.

- **Prosper Waco** is a Collective Impact initiative that focuses on issues of education, health, and financial security in the Greater Waco community, bringing together stakeholders from all corners of the community as steering committee members and implementation partners. This includes local elected officials and their staff, business and non-profit leaders, education and healthcare professionals, community development organizations and other community members from throughout the City. Prosper Waco’s current goal for financial security is that at least 55 percent of Waco residents will live with income above 200 percent of the federal poverty level by 2020, a nearly 11 percentage point increase from the current share of Waco’s population living with income at or above that level. To meet this goal, the initiative is spearheading several projects including a referral network to help low-income individuals secure and maintain employment, an accredited work readiness certificate that local job education programs can offer, a collaborative effort to connect local college students to opportunities in the Waco community, and a financial literacy and
education initiative.

- **The Greater Cincinnati Foundation (GCF)** has championed the idea of Collective Impact in Cincinnati, bringing together a group of seven regional partners that are working to achieve systems change in education, economic opportunity, and police–community relations. In 2012, GCF committed to investing $3.5 million to support the initiative. As of 2016, that investment has led to $820 million in new leveraged funding. GCF holds regular “community of practice” meetings that convene members of the regional partner organizations and other key community partners, to facilitate peer learning, progress tracking, and brainstorming about new solutions and actions to pursue collaboratively. One of the group's key goals is for at least 90 percent of the TriState's labor force to secure “gainful employment” by 2020, up from 87 percent in 2012. As a result of their work toward this goal, more than 10,000 individuals have been served across five career pathways, with an 89 percent completion rate and 78 percent rate of employment upon completion. Moreover, 67 percent of participants had retained their employment one year later.

- **The Opportunity Youth Incentive Fund (OYIF)** in Los Angeles helped the City adopt a Collective Impact strategy to improve opportunities and outcomes for disconnected youth. Through this effort, the City created a multi-partner funding stream to sustain youth reengagement centers, which are designed to recruit disconnected youth and help them earn a high school credential. This initiative has brought together the Mayor, City Council, Los Angeles Economic and Workforce Development Department, Los Angeles Workforce Investment Board and Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). After conducting a two-year study of dropout recovery efforts around the country, these partners held a competitive procurement process for a system of 13 reengagement centers that co-locate LAUSD Pupil Services and attendance counselors and serve as an entry point for reengaged youth pursuing secondary or postsecondary education. The centers also offer programs through the Workforce Investment Act, such as academic enrichment, career exploration and vocational training.

- **Opportunity Chicago** was a 5-year Collective Impact effort, composed of government agencies, foundations, non-profits and employers that successfully helped 5,000 public housing residents to access job training and quality employment. The founding partners, the Mayor’s Office of Workforce Development and Partnership for New Communities, were joined by the non-profit Chicago Jobs Council, which served as the backbone organization. This collaborative convened an independent advisory group that represented foundations, city agencies, housing authority, higher education institutions, Chamber of Commerce, non-profits, and U.S. Department of Labor. After deciding on goals and strategies for the initiative, this advisory group split into seven different working groups that each focused on subsets of the issue, like employer engagement, service provision and data collection and analysis. At the end of five years, Opportunity Chicago had raised a total of $27 million from a combination of public and private sources, which they used to place 5,696 public housing residents in employment. More than 6,700 residents participated in the initiative, with 77 percent working after exiting the program and more than 50 percent of those placements retaining positions for two or more years.
The Network recommends the City initiate a process to develop a shared vision for the Southside that will better unite and align the City, stakeholders and resident efforts and guide incremental steps toward measured progress. The Network suggests the City of Peoria explore a Collective Impact model as a potential framework to develop that shared vision and better align resources. This initial process could take six months to one year to allow for involvement of all appropriate stakeholders including residents, but is necessary to set the foundation for long-term sustainable collaboration.

CONTINUED DEMONSTRATION OF THE SOUTHSIDE AS A PRIORITY AREA

The City has already made some significant commitments to rebuild trust and refocus attention on the Southside. Establishing the South Village TIF zone, requesting assistance from the National Resource Network and the partnership with the Network team throughout the technical assistance engagement indicates the City’s intentions to improve outcomes for residents.

Continuing to lift up the Southside as a priority area, not just for District 1 but for all of Peoria, is critical to support and further build momentum.

Historical neglect of struggling communities is an unfortunate reality in many places, including in the Southside, and such history generally results in mounting cynicism and distrust among some residents. As the City of Peoria continues to take specific, concrete steps to illustrate its commitment, trust should improve and community engagement will be productive.

National examples of efforts to demonstrate new or renewed municipal commitment in communities include the following:

- Relocate a City department or City agency’s office space or facilities to the area.
- Target public works dollars to address the most visible problem areas along main streets.
- Review and revise inequitable policies and procedures for infrastructure improvements.
- Reprioritize spending of CDBG/HOME funds based on need.
- Institute procurement policies that prioritize hiring of residents from the area.

Appropriate media and outreach strategies should accompany and support such initiatives.
ENHANCED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TO EXPLORE A COLLECTIVE IMPACT MODEL

Ongoing engagement with stakeholders and community members is critical to continue the conversation and explore a Collective Impact model as a possible framework. The largest threat to the success of this endeavor is losing momentum. The Network recommends the City serve as a convener and facilitator for conversations about how to increase collaboration between anchor institutions, the City, service-providers and residents in the Southside.

Conversations should focus on how a Collective Impact model is different than existing collaborative approaches, and whether the structure would better facilitate partnerships. In addition to discussing the components of the model, the Network recommends discussing the necessary conditions for the model to be successful. During Paul Schmitz’s presentation, he emphasized the importance of community readiness in order for a Collective Impact initiative to be effective:

• Does Peoria have credible champions and neutral conveners?
• Is there a shared sense of urgency that more or better status quo won’t solve the problem?
• Are there significant resources and attention, and both public and private funders willing to collaborate?
• Is there trust among the diverse leaders and stakeholders necessary to solve the problem?

If any of these conditions are not present, additional actions may be necessary to develop readiness. The Network recommends four strategies to move Peoria toward a community culture that is conducive to Collective Impact: 1) conduct asset mapping; 2) facilitate communication; 3) initiate proactive inclusion; and 4) develop sensitivity.

The first step is to conduct a thorough asset mapping of the Southside to better understand the complex network of resident groups, service providers, City programs, community services and opportunities available to residents. An interactive online tool should be developed that is editable by the public, to fully capture all of the neighborhood’s assets and provide an up-to-date record of developing activities. Asset mapping should include everything from community gardens and murals to non-profits and businesses, as well as human capital resources. This is important for several reasons: In addition to being better positioned to identify duplicative services, gaps in services, and opportunities for collaboration, asset mapping will help City staff and stakeholders shift their perspective from a deficit-based model of community development (what’s wrong, how do we fix it?) to an asset-based model (how do we build on strengths?). Also, asset mapping will help identify the full list of key participants to engage in the conversation.

The release of the interactive tool will help reignite the conversation with residents, stakeholders and others in the Southside about collaboration focused on the Southside,
and allow the City to assess if there is sufficient interest from the community to pursue Collective Impact. To maintain engagement, the City could set up a page on the website specifically highlighting the Southside and include information about the developing Collective Impact initiative. This page could be a central place to advertise upcoming meetings, release updates, cross-promote among various collaborations, highlight City efforts in the Southside, lift up successes, spotlight neighborhood residents or post relevant resources from around the web.

Through developing the asset mapping tool, the City will gain a more comprehensive picture of key players to engage in conversation. The Network recommends that the City make a concerted effort to cultivate resident leadership and diligently work to identify and include leaders from varying levels and from multiple generations. Decisions about the location and time of meetings, for example, should be considered from the perspective of community residents to ensure equitable representation. Collective Impact practitioners John Kania and Mark Kramer emphasize the importance of using an ‘equity lens’, encouraging practitioners of Collective Impact to “pay explicit attention to policies, practices, and culture that are reinforcing patterns of inequity in the community.” The most important task of the convener is to provide opportunities for genuine engagement of groups who have historically been excluded from decision-making about their own community. Creative approaches must be taken to include everyone’s voice in the conversation.

Engaging community residents and leaders will be more productive if professionals and City staff involved are sensitive to different perspectives that may emerge during this process and understand structures of power and issues of inequity. Cultural competency, or the ability to engage appropriately with members of a different culture, is important to develop partnerships and facilitate collaboration.

The City should lead by example to increase the cultural competency of their own staff, and encourage the public to gain knowledge on these topics as well to improve community cohesion. To begin, the Network recommends an internal book club for City staff to help them think differently about their daily activities.

Broader public engagement, coupled with more targeted conversations about collaboration, creates an opportunity to update the general public on developments in the Southside.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A STEERING COMMITTEE

The Network recommends the City assemble a diverse, representative steering committee to confirm community interest in the model and to transition decision-making power from a single entity to a collection of entities. The steering committee will act as the board of directors for the new Collective Impact initiative, and will work together to identify a common agenda, shared metrics, identify and secure funding, and hire backbone staff to coordinate meetings and perform administrative tasks. For more details, refer to Paul Schmitz’ presentation in the Appendices.

Someone from the City should be appointed to manage the steering committee until
the backbone organization is established. Forming a new entity is time intensive, so the Network recommends that at least 50 percent of the individual's time be dedicated to establishing the Collective Impact model for approximately six months. It is vital that the person selected is culturally competent, feels comfortable connecting with residents of the Southside, but also has access to decision-makers in City leadership.

One task of the City staff point person will be to manage communications inquiries and outreach until the backbone staff are in place. Consistency of message is key, as is maintaining professionalism in all responses. We recommend the lead individual work with the City's Public Information Officer Stacy Peterson to develop a comprehensive, proactive communications plan.

The steering committee should be comprised of 15–25 individuals, evenly representing residents and other stakeholders. It is critical for the successful formation and implementation of the common agenda to include meaningful participation from current Southside residents. Nominal involvement of community residents, or solely relying on involvement of community leadership to represent residents will not produce the desired results. Also important for the success of the steering committee will be including representatives from all related collaborative efforts including Alignment Peoria, the Maternal/Child Health Initiative, Invest-Health, Greater Peoria Economic Development Council, etc. Individuals who want to be involved but are not able to commit to serve on the steering committee can still be engaged through working groups, interviews or as champions.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS & RESOURCES

The Network recommends the City utilize existing resources to successfully launch the Collective Impact model.

The Collective Impact Forum at www.collectiveimpactforum.org can be an excellent resource for videos, webinars, articles, a self-assessment, and other resources. Below are a few resources that are particularly helpful as Peoria moves forward. Lastly, if challenges are encountered, we recommend Peoria take advantage of outside expertise and bring in a national firm with experience establishing similar models or collaborations.

This webinar discusses how to address racial equity head-on and includes strategies on inclusivity and encouraging diverse leadership: https://collectiveimpactforum.org/resources/advancing-racial-equity-through-community-engagement-collective-impact

One concern in Peoria may be how to navigate a landscape with multiple Collective Impact initiatives that overlap. This webinar looks at two case studies that share their lessons learned on aligning and collaborating with other collaborations: http://collectiveimpactforum.org/resources/too-much-collective-too-little-impact-aligning-multiple-initiatives-one-community

‘Tools for Steering Committees’ is a helpful set of resources that include guidance on selecting steering committee members, a sample job description, examples of meeting agendas and discussion guides: https://collectiveimpactforum.org/resources/tools-steering-committees
Collaborating to create the common agenda is the first task of the new steering committee. This webinar and the accompanying print materials may be useful for getting started: https://collectiveimpactforum.org/resources/collaborating-create-common-agenda


4. The racial/ethnic concentration threshold is straightforward: R/CAP/ECAPs must have a non-White population of 50 percent or more. Regarding the poverty threshold, Wilson (1980) defines neighborhoods of “extreme poverty” as census tracts with 40 percent or more of individuals living at or below the poverty line. See www.huduser.gov/publications/.../FR-5173-P-01_AFFH_data_documentation.pdf.

5. *AFFH Rule Guidebook: New Rule, Same Law: Introduction to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) and the AFFH Rule, What is the Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH)?*


APPENDICES

The following appendices include a selection of deliverables produced for this engagement.
Introduction

1970 – 2014 Historic Trends

• Population
• Age
• Racial Composition
• Income
• Poverty
• Education
• Employment
• Average Home Value
• Average Structure Age
The Southside is home to 14,898 people including 5,089 children.

Demographic Indicators
Change in Population 1970 - 2014

Legend
- Southside Target Area
- Decrease by 50% or more
- Decrease by 1 - 49%
- Increase by 1 - 50%
- Increase by 51 - 99%
- Increase by 100% or more
Change in Racial Demographics

### Southside

- **80s**
  - White: 12,915
  - Black: 685
  - Other: 9,276
  - Hispanic: 9,108

- **90s**
  - White: 11,660
  - Black: 472
  - Other: 12,063
  - Hispanic: 79,892

- **00s**
  - White: 12,083
  - Black: 6,325
  - Other: 15,386
  - Hispanic: 73,855

- **10s**
  - White: 7,426
  - Black: 1,629
  - Other: 13,543
  - Hispanic: 4,257

### Rest of Peoria City

- **80s**
  - White: 91,087
  - Black: 1,308
  - Other: 197,090
  - Hispanic: 79,892

- **90s**
  - White: 11,713
  - Black: 1,356
  - Other: 197,090
  - Hispanic: 3,222

- **00s**
  - White: 15,386
  - Black: 7,857
  - Other: 197,090
  - Hispanic: 1,629

- **10s**
  - White: 13,543
  - Black: 4,257
  - Other: 197,090
  - Hispanic: 851

Population Age Composition

### Southside

- **1970**
  - Under 18: 12%
  - 18-34: 21%
  - 35-54: 37%
  - 55-64: 19%
  - 65+: 11%

- **1980**
  - Under 18: 12%
  - 18-34: 16%
  - 35-54: 36%
  - 55-64: 23%
  - 65+: 12%

- **1990**
  - Under 18: 14%
  - 18-34: 23%
  - 35-54: 36%
  - 55-64: 22%
  - 65+: 11%

- **2000**
  - Under 18: 12%
  - 18-34: 23%
  - 35-54: 34%
  - 55-64: 23%
  - 65+: 11%

- **2014**
  - Under 18: 11%
  - 18-34: 22%
  - 35-54: 33%
  - 55-64: 25%
  - 65+: 12%

### Rest of the City

- **1970**
  - Under 18: 11%
  - 18-34: 22%
  - 35-54: 36%
  - 55-64: 25%
  - 65+: 14%

- **1980**
  - Under 18: 10%
  - 18-34: 25%
  - 35-54: 34%
  - 55-64: 27%
  - 65+: 12%

- **1990**
  - Under 18: 14%
  - 18-34: 20%
  - 35-54: 33%
  - 55-64: 27%
  - 65+: 24%

- **2000**
  - Under 18: 14%
  - 18-34: 24%
  - 35-54: 32%
  - 55-64: 24%
  - 65+: 23%

- **2014**
  - Under 18: 11%
  - 18-34: 25%
  - 35-54: 33%
  - 55-64: 26%
  - 65+: 27%
Socio-Economic Indicators

Change in Family Income 1970 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rest of the City</th>
<th>Southside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$83,185.01</td>
<td>$50,465.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$83,516.84</td>
<td>$44,179.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$85,143.92</td>
<td>$36,329.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$92,227.14</td>
<td>$37,433.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$88,210.51</td>
<td>$36,164.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Poverty Rate 1970 - 2014

- Southside: Target Area
- Decrease by more than 25%
- Decrease by 10 - 24%
- Decrease by 1 - 9%
- Increase by 1 - 25%
- Increase by more than 25%

Legend

Change in Average Family Income in 2014 Dollars
1970 - 2014

National Resource Network 2016

Southside
Rest of the City
Change in Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Completed 1970</th>
<th>Southside</th>
<th>Rest of the City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree or Higher</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No High School Diploma</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Educational Attainment

Highest Degree Completed 2014

- Bachelors degree or Higher
  - Southside: 6%
  - Rest of the City: 31%

- Some College
  - Southside: 21%
  - Rest of the City: 31%

- High school diploma
  - Southside: 13%
  - Rest of the City: 25%

- No High School Diploma
  - Southside: 40%
  - Rest of the City: 33%

Change in Unemployment Rate

0% 5% 10% 15% 20% 25%


- Southside
- Rest of the City
Housing Market Indicators
Average Home Value

Change in Average Home Value 1970 - 2014

Legend
- Southside
- Target Area
- Decrease by more than 25%
- Decrease by 1 - 25%
- Increase by 1 - 50%
- Increase by 50 - 100%
- Increase by more than 100%
Owner-Occupied Units by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SouthSide</th>
<th>Rest of Peoria City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home Ownership Rate

Southside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner Occupied Units</th>
<th>Renter Occupied Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rest of the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner Occupied Units</th>
<th>Renter Occupied Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• A number of factors contributed to these trends
• Next presentation we will look into the factors that contributed to neighborhood change
• July presentation will show the projection of where the Southside will be if these trends continue

Data Source

• Geolytics (Census and ACS Data)
• All dollar figures are provided in 2014 dollars
The Southside: Making the Case

Day 1 - July 11th, 2016

Agenda – Day 1

• 12:30pm – Lunch by Mama G’s & Table Introductions
• 1:00pm – Welcome, Mayor Ardis and Councilwoman Moore
• 1:15pm – Part 1 – The Data: Past, Present & Future
• 2:30pm – Break
• 2:40pm - Part 2 – The Data on Opportunity
• 3:15pm - Part 3 – Potential Approaches for Peoria
• 4:00pm - Adjourn
Presentation Objectives

• Illustrate the extent of the past, present and future challenges in the Southside
• Illuminate the effects of concentrated poverty
• Improving the Southside contributes to the overall wellbeing of Peoria
• Make the economic case for coordinated investment in the Southside
• Explore a framework to better align resources and improve outcomes for the Southside and all of Peoria

Part 1: The Data – Past, Present & Future
Historical Trends

- City & Regional History
- Declining Industry
- Population Migration (in Peoria and regionally)
- Annexation to the north
- Concentration of Poverty
- Disinvestment
- Urban Renewal

Annexation History

Legend
- Prior to 1931
- 1931
- 1931 - 1960
- 1961 - 1965
- 1966 - 1970
- 1971 - 1975
- 1976 - 1980
- 1981 - 1985
- 1986 - 1990
- 1991 - 1995
- 1996 - 2000
- 2001 - 2005
- 2006 - 2010

City of Peoria, IL
2030 Comprehensive Plan

Prepared by: Department of Planning and Economic Development
Illinois Institute of Technology
Until the City Council
Finalized, 2008
• Southside population has halved since 1970
• Population in the rest of Peoria is stable
Change in Family Income 1970 - 2014

- In the Southside, income has decreased by 28% since 1970 but has remained steady since 1990
- In the rest of Peoria, income has increased 6%

R/CAPs and Segregation

- The Southside is designated a R/CAP – racially concentrated area of poverty in accordance with HUD’s Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule (purple outline)
Socio-economic and Demographic Factors

- Regression analysis estimates relationships between variables

- The data in Peoria is consistent with national research

Housing Factors

- There is a strong connection between the housing market stability in the Southside and the poverty rate
## Investment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Average Expenditure Per Student</th>
<th>Amount of HMDA Loan</th>
<th>Amount of Loan to Business</th>
<th>Number of Business Establishments</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Expenditure Per Student</td>
<td>-0.1072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of HMDA Loan</td>
<td>-0.2974</td>
<td>0.2532</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Loan to Businesses</td>
<td>-0.0179</td>
<td>0.4248</td>
<td>-0.0579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Business Establishments</td>
<td>-0.1654</td>
<td>0.4604</td>
<td>0.4664</td>
<td>0.5116</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>-0.2016</td>
<td>-0.4087</td>
<td>-0.0046</td>
<td>-0.2082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty Concentration

### 1970

Total People in Poverty: 14,572
Poverty Concentration

1980
Total People in Poverty: 14,055

1990
Total People in Poverty: 19,867
Poverty Concentration

2000
Total People in Poverty: 19,242

2014
Total People in Poverty: 23,600
Since 1970, Peoria has seen an increase in the number of census tracts with poverty rates above 20% (“high poverty areas”) and those with rates above 40% (“extreme poverty areas”).

**Spread of High Poverty Neighborhoods**

**1970**

**Spread of High Poverty Neighborhoods**

**1980**

Since 1970, Peoria has seen an increase in the number of census tracts with poverty rates above 20% (“high poverty areas”) and those with rates above 40% (“extreme poverty areas”).
Since 1970, Peoria has seen an increase in the number of census tracts with poverty rates above 20% (“high poverty areas”) and those with rates above 40% (“extreme poverty areas”).
Spread of High Poverty Neighborhoods

Since 1970, Peoria has seen an increase in the number of census tracts with poverty rates above 20% (“high poverty areas”) and those with rates above 40% (“extreme poverty areas”).

Increasing Concentration of Poverty

PEOPLE IN POVERTY BY NEIGHBORHOOD POVERTY RATE

1970

- Low Poverty Area (<20% poverty)
- Poverty Area (20% to 40% poverty)
- Concentrated Poverty Area (>40% poverty)
Increasing Concentration of Poverty

**PEOPLE IN POVERTY BY NEIGHBORHOOD POVERTY RATE**

1980

- Low Poverty Area (<20% poverty)
- Poverty Area (20% to 40% poverty)
- Concentrated Poverty Area (>40% poverty)

1990

- Low Poverty Area (<20% poverty)
- Poverty Area (20% to 40% poverty)
- Concentrated Poverty Area (>40% poverty)
Increasing Concentration of Poverty

PEOPLE IN POVERTY BY NEIGHBORHOOD POVERTY RATE

2000

- Low Poverty Area (<20% poverty)
- Poverty Area (20% to 40% poverty)
- Concentrated Poverty Area (>40% poverty)

Increasing Concentration of Poverty

PEOPLE IN POVERTY BY NEIGHBORHOOD POVERTY RATE

2014

- Low Poverty Area (<20% poverty)
- Poverty Area (20% to 40% poverty)
- Concentrated Poverty Area (>40% poverty)
More Peorians Living in High Poverty Areas

TOTAL POPULATION BY NEIGHBORHOOD POVERTY RATE
- Concentrated Poverty Area (>40% poverty)
- Poverty Area (20% to 40% poverty)
- Low Poverty Area (<20% poverty)


Impacts of Concentrated Poverty

When poverty is highly concentrated, the consequences extend beyond the immediate neighborhood residents. For example, when poverty rates hit a tipping point (above 20%) surrounding property values and rents plummet – causing the city’s overall tax base to shrink.

A study of 100 metro areas in the U.S. estimated that if people in poverty were redistributed so that all census tracks stayed below the 20% tipping point, then those cities would have experienced an estimated 13% increase in residential property values, worth $461 billion, between 1990 and 2000.
Concentrated Poverty Affects Everyone

Living in poverty has serious consequences for families -- affecting their health, access to quality education, exposure to violence, and more.

But when poverty is concentrated, it also has ripple effects throughout the city.

28,000 people in Peoria live above the poverty line, but in neighborhoods where high poverty rates (above 20%) negatively affect property values, crime rates, employment opportunities, etc.

All city residents are affected by the costs of concentrated poverty – through higher taxes or reduced city services.

Hidden Public Costs

Studies have found that when poverty is concentrated, it has an even greater impact on indirect costs than on direct poverty costs (welfare, social services). These locally-borne costs include:

- **Fire protection.** Older, dilapidated housing presents greater fire hazards.
- **Police expenditures.** One study estimated that higher crime rates, driven by concentrated poverty, cost cities an additional $30 per capita.
- **Affordable Housing.** Administration costs and local matching funds for federal and state programs.
- **Public transportation costs.** Concentrated poverty increases usage, but fare revenues rarely cover the costs of maintenance.
- **High sanitation and infrastructure costs.** Overcrowding and poor housing maintenance require more city services.
Poverty Rate (Actual Data)

Poverty Thresholds 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in Family/Household</th>
<th>Poverty Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$24,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$28,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$32,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$36,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$40,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For families/households with more than 8 persons, add $4,160 for each additional person.
Poverty Rate Projection

Breakout Session #1

• What were some “aha’s” that happened for you during the presentation?
• What would happen to the Southside and to Peoria if we continue on the trajectory presented?
• What are some implications you see of the data presented?
Part 2: Opportunity in the Southside

• “Opportunity is a situation or condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel” – Kirwan Institute

• Geographies of Opportunity Research

• The Enterprise Communities of Opportunity Index
Comparing Access to Opportunity

Opportunity Components

- **Resident Housing Security**
  - number of low-income severely cost burdened households
  - Percent of overcrowded households (more than one person per room)
  - Percent of minority (black and Hispanics in the tract)
  - Percent of children and seniors in the tract
Opportunity Components

• Housing market condition:
  – median housing value
  – vacancy rate
  – median gross rent, and
  – number of mortgage loans originated

Opportunity Components

• Resident connection to Transit:
  – percent of workers who use public transportation for work
  – vehicle ownership rate
  – proximity variables such as distance to the nearest library, grocery store
Opportunity Components

• Economic mobility and inclusion dimension:
  – poverty
  – unemployment
  – educational attainment and
  – median household income

Opportunity Components

• Resident health and Wellness:
  – whether the tract is in medically underserved region
  – the number of primary care physicians active in the tract and
  – crime rate per capita
Southside Compared with Rest of the City

Southside

Resident Connection to Transit
Resident Housing Security
Housing Market Condition
Resident Health and Wellness
Economic Mobility and Inclusion

Rest of Peoria

Resident Connection to Transit
Resident Housing Security
Housing Market Condition
Resident Health and Wellness
Economic Mobility and Inclusion

Southside Census Tracts

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 5
- 6
- 9
- 50

Zip codes 61605 & 61607
CT5 Compared with Rest of the City

Census Tract 5

Resident Connection to Transit

Resident Housing Security

Resident Health and Wellness

Housing Market Condition

Economic Mobility and Inclusion

Rest of Peoria

Resident Connection to Transit

Resident Housing Security

Resident Health and Wellness

Housing Market Condition

Economic Mobility and Inclusion
Southside Compared to CT33

Southside
- Resident Connection to Transit
- Resident Housing Security
- Housing Market Condition
- Economic Mobility and Inclusion
- Resident Health and Wellness

Census Tract 33
- Resident Connection to Transit
- Resident Housing Security
- Housing Market Condition
- Economic Mobility and Inclusion
- Resident Health and Wellness

CT33

Map of CT33 area.
Questions?

- Please email questions to Tina Dudley, tdudley@enterprisecommunity.org or ask us after the event if you don’t get a chance during the Q&A
Part 3: Potential Approaches for Peoria

Potential Approaches

1. Increase income of existing residents through improved access to opportunity
2. Provide options for residents to move to higher opportunity areas
3. Increase socio-economic diversity
Leveraging Assets

• Southside assets
  – Historical significance
  – Human capital
  – Nonprofit capacity
  – Proximity to Downtown
  – Past investment
  – Expected future investment (CSO)
  – Gateway to the airport

The Need for Collaboration

• Adaptive challenges require cross-sector collaborative solutions
  – Commitment: Public commitments of action essentially puts an organization’s reputation up as collateral for the commitment.
  – Partnership: Give and take defines a partnership.
  – Vulnerability: Requires that we let go of control. No one of us can solve the problems we are facing, but few of us are integrating this reality into our work.
  – Emergence: Our problems are bigger than any of us. We must summon the courage to evolve beyond competition to understand individual success as an outcome of collective success.
Breakout Session #2

• Based on what you know, and the presentation, what opportunities are there for the future advancement of the Southside?

• What else (besides funding) is needed for change to occur?

Agenda – Day 2

• 11:30am  Lunch by Childers Catering
• 11:45am  Welcome, Mayor Ardis and Councilwoman Moore
• 11:50am  Recap on Day 1
• 12:00pm  Paul Schmitz Interactive Session on Collective Impact
• 1:30pm   Break
• 2:45pm   Conclusions and Next Steps
• 3:00pm   Adjourn
Leadership for Collective Impact

Paul Schmitz
CEO, Leading Inside Out and
Senior Advisor, The Collective Impact Forum
@paulschmitz1

www.collectiveimpactforum.org
www.leadinginsideout.org

AGENDA

1. What is Collective Impact?
2. Leadership for Collective Impact
INTRODUCTION: TRIZ

Step 1
Make a list of all the things you can do to make sure that you achieve the worst result imaginable in setting up a collaborative initiative
- Reflect individually
- Discuss as a 3 or 4 person group

Step 2
Review this list and ask, “Is there anything that I am currently doing that resembles this item?” in a collaborative/coalition I’m part of. Be brutally honest
- Discuss as a 3 or 4 person group

Step 3
Go through the items on your second list and decide what steps will help you stop what you know creates undesirable results
- Discuss as a 3 or 4 person group

Collective Impact

Teen birthrate in Milwaukee drops for 7th consecutive year

Rushed by another dramatic decline in the teen birthrate among Hispanic girls, Milwaukee’s overall birthrate among girls ages 15 to 17 dropped in 2013, for the seventh year in a row, preliminary data shows.

The decline in the rate among non-Hispanic black teens, however, took an upturn during the year, along with a slight upturn among non-Hispanic white girls, according to the data compiled for the United Way of Greater Milwaukee’s Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative.

But it’s against the backdrop of another decline in the overall rate, and a 50% decrease in that rate between 2009 and 2013, that Mary Cunnar, an influential with the initiative, has announced the ambitious goal of reducing the 2013 overall rate by another 50% by 2016.

“If last year we celebrated a momentous accomplishment by not only meeting our goal of reducing Milwaukee’s teen birthrate by 40% by 2013, but increasing that goal three years early,” Cunnar, a member of the initiative’s oversight committees, said in a news release.

“This year we are saying, ‘Let’s keep the momentum going. We have made significant progress, but our base is still too high.’
Collective Impact Forum

What it takes

Backbone

Continuous Communication

Mutually Reinforcing Activities

Shared Measurement

Common Agenda
Role of Backbone

*Lead the Process*

- Guide vision and strategy
- Help connect the dots
- Establish shared measurement practices
- Build public will
- Advance policy
- Mobilize funding

Readiness

1. Credible Champions and Neutral Conveners
2. Shared sense of urgency that more or better status quo won’t solve the problem
3. Significant resources/attention, public/private funders willing to collaborate
4. Trust among the diverse leaders and stakeholders necessary to solve the problem
Peoria

What do you find compelling/challenging about the model?

Which of these factors are strong in your community?

1. Credible Champions and Neutral Conveners
2. Shared sense of urgency that more or better status quo won’t solve the problem
3. Significant resources/attention, public/private funders willing to collaborate
4. Trust among the diverse leaders and stakeholders necessary to solve the problem

First Big Shift

Activities to Results

Results to Activities
Activity-Based

- Population Impact
- Grow Program
- Measure Outcomes
- Build Services
- Identify Needs

Results-Based

- Population Result
- Indicators/Measures
- Factor Analysis/Story behind curve
- Targets/Strategies
- Data & Evidence
- Who all do we need to do what?
Second Big Shift

*Culture Eats Strategy for Breakfast*
- Peter Drucker

**Backbone**
- Continuous Communication
- Mutually Reinforcing Activities
- Shared Measurement
- Common Agenda

Stepping Up

When did you first step up on behalf of an issue, cause, or person important to you?
Defining Leadership

1. An action many can take, not a position few can hold
2. Taking responsibility to work with others on common goals
3. Practice of values that engage commitment from others

A Leadership Story
Who was the leader?

Social Change has always come from the leadership of the many

Practicing Values

1. Asset-Based
2. Diversity & Inclusion
3. Collaboration
4. Continuous Learning
5. Integrity
Asset-Based

1 Doing *with*, not *to* or *for* communities

Introductions

What 2-3 gifts or skills make you a good family member and friend?

What 2-3 skills make you an effective leader?

What are 2-3 talents or hobbies you love doing and can get lost in for hours?
Assets

1 What can residents do best by themselves?

2 What can residents do with a little help from institutions?

3 What can institutions do for residents they cannot do for themselves?

Family Independence Initiative
Community Engagement Matters

Increasing Impact on Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMING</th>
<th>CONSULTING</th>
<th>INVOLVING</th>
<th>COLLABORATING</th>
<th>EMPOWERING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing balanced and objective information about new programs or services, and about the reasons for choosing them. Providing updates during implementation.</td>
<td>Inviting feedback on alternatives, analyses, and decisions related to new programs or services. Letting people know how their feedback has influenced program decisions.</td>
<td>Working with community members to ensure that their aspirations and concerns are considered at every stage of planning and decision-making. Letting people know how their involvement has influenced program decisions.</td>
<td>Enabling community members to participate in every aspect of planning and decision-making for new programs or services.</td>
<td>Giving community members sole decision-making authority over new programs or services, and allowing professionals to serve only in consultative and supportive roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fulfill Promises
Build Capacity

Diversity & Inclusion

2 When you change who is at the table, you change the table itself
Viewing Equity

- Disaggregate data,
- Identify disparities,
- Differentiate services

Who is at table
How is view distorted
Correct it

Issue Experience
How many people on your staff have been directly impacted by the issue?

- Personally have experienced issue
- Personally have worked with population
- Personal family has experience with issue
- Member of targeted population

Demographic Relevance
How many people on your team are demographically like target population?

- Represent other historically disadvantaged groups
- Similar to target population
- Not from historically disadvantaged groups

Direct Engagement
How many people work directly or indirectly with target population

- Have lived in target area
- Have lived in neighborhood
- Not from or living in target area

Geographic Relevance
How many people on your team grew up in or live in the neighborhood you are serving?
Building Equity In

What steps will be needed to ensure collective impact is guided by equity in Peoria?

Collaboration

3 Collaboration is about building TRUST
Continuous Learning

4 Own mistakes, ask for feedback, and ask for help

Things I Suck At

- Interpersonal conflict
- Personnel management
- Patience with process
- Administrative paperwork
- Being punctual
- Small talk
- Time Management
- Fundraising
- Active listening
- Trusting my instincts
- Delegating responsibility
- Making unpopular decisions
- Staying attentive in long meetings
Learning Culture

What are two things you suck at?

What are two things your organization sucks at?

How do we create a culture of learning?

Integrity

Be true to your “be” and accountable to those you work with and results for those you serve
Lead Together

Create an inclusive, collaborative culture that fosters community engagement, learning, and accountability for shared results

Leadership for Collective Impact
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The Communities of Opportunity Index

Robust Housing Metrics & Real Time Data
Actionable data about the families experiencing housing insecurity and the quality of the housing markets in which they live

Evidence-Based Assessment Framework
An index derived from the evidence on the factors that work to support positive long-term outcomes for low- and moderate-income families

Open Source Platform for Residents & Other Users
A tool that captures the voices and perspectives of residents and helps “ground-truth” the metrics in the index

Community Engagement & Partnership Toolkit
Downloadable resources for our partners to interpret the data & engage community stakeholders to take action

Millions of low-income families in the United States are housing insecure (meaning they pay more than half of their earnings for housing) or lack connections to key community resources such as jobs, education, transit or health. Enterprise has outlined an ambitious goal to eliminate housing insecurity and expand opportunity for millions of these families.

The relationship between access to opportunity for families and the dynamics of the housing market in various places is a complicated one. Although there are many metrics available to characterize the challenges facing low-income families today, there is currently no singular measure of opportunity that truly incorporates the core, multi-dimensional value that healthy, affordable housing provides to low-income families or the communities in which they live. The lack of a standard measure that can be broadly applied, in the wide variety of community and organizational contexts in which this issue is key to decision-making, presents Enterprise with the occasion to add real value.

Having conducted a thorough review of the existing indices, atlases and other publicly available measurement resources being used to assess the challenges faced by low-income families, we see the need for a related tool that can advance the public conversation about opportunity beyond its current dimensions. The Communities of Opportunity Index provides a framework for measuring the basic indicators of well-being for families across the United States. As an assessment and engagement tool, our index is composed of the factors that are strongly correlated with long-term positive outcomes for low-income families and leverages the tools that already exist in the public domain, explicitly addressing the important limitations of these existing tools in our effort.

When publicly launched in 2016, the index will feature a robust set of housing metrics, real-time data updates, an open source platform to capture resident perspectives and a set of embedded tools for engaging community leaders.
The Communities of Opportunity Index

A Community of Opportunity is one that provides healthy, affordable and appropriate housing, ample transportation options and supportive community resources for all residents. Once in place, those resources enhance health and wellness, safety, economic mobility and foster residents’ engagement in the community’s civic, economic and social life.

As researchers continue to investigate the links between neighborhood and life outcomes, it is increasingly clear that place matters. Where you live impacts your chances in life and plays a particularly significant role in shaping future outcomes for children. Importantly, it is the quality of place that matters. Poor neighborhood conditions have been shown to have deleterious effects on a wide range of outcomes, including health, children’s performance in school, employment and lifetime earnings. Some individuals, of course, can overcome place-based obstacles and do well despite these impediments to success. For far too many however, their success in life, the quality of education they receive, the jobs they take, their health, and the social networks they access, are all limited by the places where they live. Strong research now suggests that these limiting circumstances (or lack of opportunity) can have a cumulative, even inter-generational, impact on families and communities.

The Communities of Opportunity Index will measure the extent to which people at all income levels have access to the mix of resources, institutions, and services they need to pursue their goals. The index will measure opportunity for any location in the United States across five core dimensions that include metrics highly correlated with positive long-term outcomes for families. Each of the five core dimensions is composed of a set of metrics that addresses a specific question that helps us understand the picture of opportunity for residents.

OTHER FEATURES OF THE INDEX

- Real-Time Housing Market Data
- Open Source Platform for Residents and Other Users To Ground-Truth the Metrics
- Community Engagement & Partnership Toolkit
The index will better position Enterprise to:

- Provide a refined, more nuanced measure of opportunity
- Inform our strategy, prioritize our efforts and program targeting
- Influence and engage new partners
- “Ground-truth” the metrics in the index with resident perspectives
- Advocate for new resources to solve problems
- Compare progress within or across our impact markets
- Reframe the current conversation away from community “deficits” to an “assets-based” frame
- Inform the work of a growing number of researchers interested in measuring opportunity across a wide variety of places and populations

Using the Index, our partners will be better positioned to:

- Make the case for a stronger response to the housing issues that face low- and moderate-income residents
- More comprehensively address the needs of the residents they serve
- Gauge their progress relative to other communities in the region and nationally
- Build stronger cross-sector partnerships and develop a plan for coordinated, collaborative action with other leaders
- “Ground-truth” their understanding of resident needs with those expressed directly by residents

TIMELINE FOR DEVELOPMENT

We expect to release the beta version of the index by Fall of 2016 and the final version by Spring of 2017.
The final online product will include the **Communities of Opportunity Measurement Report** which provides a profile of opportunity for each census tract in the nation, and each of the five major categories include sub-indices that measure a wide variety of opportunities in the census tracts:

![Diagram of Communities of Opportunity Measurement Report]

**Resident Housing Security**

- **Housing Stability** means that residents who choose to are able to live in a place for extended periods of time and are not facing a significant risk of losing their home or being forced to move. This is a particularly important factor for children, as frequent moves early in life have been shown to have negative impacts on children’s academic performance. Neighborhoods have greater resident housing stability when they have lower rates of severe cost burden, doubled-up households, crowded or overcrowded homes and households that are experiencing frequent moves. They also have greater housing stability when they are located in a region with lower rates of homelessness.

- **Housing Vulnerability** includes a wide range of characteristics that have been demonstrated to make residents more susceptible to housing challenges. This includes contending with personal or systematic discrimination, difficulty adjusting to market changes such as rising rents, or having a need for specialized healthcare or other services. Neighborhoods have greater resident housing vulnerability when they have a greater share of racial/ethnic minority residents, exhibit a high degree of racial/ethnic segregation, or have high shares of households with children, seniors, persons with disabilities, veterans or those with limited English proficiency.
Housing Market Condition

- **Housing Affordability** captures the extent to which households at all income levels who would like to live in a neighborhood could actually afford to do so. This includes the cost of housing, utilities and other related cost factors such as transportation which affect affordability of the location. Neighborhoods have greater housing affordability when a larger share of their units are affordable to lower income households and combined housing and transportation costs are lower.

- **Housing Availability** is a measure of how well the supply of affordable housing in a neighborhood corresponds to the demand for housing there. Neighborhoods have a greater availability of affordable housing if there is a smaller affordability gap for lower income renters, a larger share of households that are receiving housing subsidies, and moderate vacancy rates.

- **Housing Quality** accounts for the presence of housing stock characteristics in a neighborhood that might have (usually health-related) risks or negative effects on residents. Neighborhoods are assumed to have lower housing quality when the housing stock is older, there is a greater share of units that are mobile homes, boats or RVs, and there is a greater share of units that are known to suffer from at least one significant deficiency (such as lacking plumbing or kitchen appliances).

- **Housing Market Activity** captures the pace at which the neighborhood is experiencing changes in its housing stock or physical environment. Neighborhoods have a higher level of market activity when there are larger numbers of mortgage originations, greater numbers of building permits, and if it is eligible for certain federal programs through designation as a Qualified Census Tract, a Difficult to Develop Area, or a Community Reinvestment Act-eligible tract.

Resident Health and Wellness

- **Access to Healthcare** captures the level of health service in the area surrounding the neighborhood and the extent to which people in that neighborhood have sufficient access to it. Neighborhoods have greater access to healthcare when there are a larger number of service providers per capita, when low income residents have higher rates of health insurance and utilization of healthcare services.

- **Resident Health Outcomes** is a measure of resident health & wellness, regardless of healthcare service levels. Health outcomes are assumed to be better (having a higher index value) when there is lower incidence of chronic conditions such as asthma and diabetes and lower incidence of high health risk factors such as smoking, drinking and poor nutrition (e.g. not regularly consuming fruits and vegetables).
Resident Economic Mobility and Inclusion

- *Income, Poverty and Economic Mobility* captures the incomes and poverty levels in the neighborhood and the extent to which the region it is located in is likely to have a positive effect on future earnings. Index values for this section are higher when incomes are higher, there is a lower poverty rate, and economic mobility factors are more positive.

- *Employment and Economic Development* captures the degree of employment opportunities in and around the neighborhood and the extent to which residents are able to find employment. Index values are higher when there are a greater number of jobs available, more residents are employed, and there is greater investment in workforce development in the area.

- *Access to Education* captures the past educational attainment of residents and their current access to good schools. Access to education increases when residents have attained higher levels of education (i.e. higher rates of high school diplomas and college degrees) and when there is greater proximity to higher performing high schools and early-education resources such as Headstart Centers.

Resident Connection to Transit, Infrastructure, and Environment

- *Access to Transit* captures the extent to which residents of this neighborhood have access to adequate public transit service. Access to Transit increases when more workers are able to use transit to commute to and from work and when their commute times are shorter.

- *Access to Healthy Places & Other Infrastructure* captures the extent to which a neighborhood provides a safe and healthy environment in which residents can thrive. Access to Healthy Places is higher when the neighborhood is free of environmental hazards such as EPA Superfund sites, when residents are less exposed to dangerous pollutants, and when there is adequate access to groceries. Access to Other Infrastructure increases when residents have access to high-speed internet service and are proximate to amenities such as libraries.
For the City of Peoria, IL, we developed a prototype of the Communities of Opportunity Index using the five core dimensions of opportunity. In this prototype, we only used a subset of indicators from the larger group of metrics which will be used to calculate the sub-indices shown above. Therefore, the scores for each census tract in the final Index score may differ from the values depicted in the pie-radar charts below. The following variables have been included to produce the prototype index scores:

1. **Resident Housing Security**
   - Number of low-income severely cost burdened households
   - Percent of overcrowded households (more than one person per room)
   - Percent of minority (black and Hispanics in the tract)
   - Percent of children and seniors in the tract

2. **Housing market condition**
   - Median housing value
   - Vacancy rate
   - Median gross rent
   - Number of mortgage loans originated

3. **Resident health and Wellness**
   - Whether the tract is in a medically underserved region
   - The number of primary care physicians active in the tract
   - Crime rate per capita

4. **Resident connection to Transit, Infrastructure, and Environment**
   - Percent of workers who use public transportation for work
   - Vehicle ownership rate
   - Proximity variables such as distance to the nearest library, grocery store
   - Environmental Health Hazard Index

5. **Resident Economic mobility and inclusion**
   - The level of poverty
   - Unemployment
   - Educational attainment
   - Median household income

Since the above indicators have different measurement units (dollar, percent, miles, etc.), data normalization method is required before averaging values. For the prototype, we used Min-Max method which normalizes indicators to have an identical range e.g. 0-10, 0-100, etc. After normalizing the variables, the score for each census tract was calculated by taking the average value of the normalized data across all the indicators within each dimensions. A full list of indicators and a detailed discussion of the methodology will be included in the final product of the index.
### Key: Census Tract Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviated Tract Code</th>
<th>Actual Census Tract FIPS Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>17143000100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>17143000200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>17143000300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>17143000500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>17143000600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>17143000900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>17143001200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>17143001300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>17143001500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>17143001600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>17143001800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>17143001900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17143002000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>17143002100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>17143002200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>17143002300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17143002400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>17143002500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>17143002600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701</td>
<td>17143002701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2702</td>
<td>17143002702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800</td>
<td>17143002800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900</td>
<td>17143002900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>17143003000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3101</td>
<td>17143003101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3102</td>
<td>17143003102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200</td>
<td>17143003200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>17143003300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401</td>
<td>17143003401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3402</td>
<td>17143003402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900</td>
<td>17143003900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4101</td>
<td>17143004101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4102</td>
<td>17143004102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>17143004200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>17143004400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4802</td>
<td>17143004802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>17143005000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Census Tract 1300

- Resident Connection to Transit
- Resident Housing Security
- Housing Market Condition
- Economic Mobility and Inclusion
- Resident Health and Wellness
Census Tract 2200

- Resident Connection to Transit
- Resident Health and Wellness
- Economic Mobility and Inclusion
- Housing Market Condition
- Resident Housing Security
Census Tract 2701

- Resident Connection to Transit
- Resident Housing Security
- Housing Market Condition
- Economic Mobility and Inclusion
- Resident Health and Wellness