
Participation, Deliberation, and Decision Making: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Mixed- Income Developments

Urban Affairs Review
XX(X) 1–44
© The Author(s) 2012
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1078087412450151
<http://uar.sagepub.com>



Robert Chaskin¹, Amy Khare¹, and Mark Joseph²

Abstract

This paper explores the mechanisms, processes, and dynamics of participation and deliberation in three newly created, mixed-income communities being built on the footprint of former public housing developments in Chicago. Our findings reflect enduring dilemmas about the challenge of democratic participation and representation for low-income citizens in the context of urban revitalization efforts. In the current case, a fundamental tension exists between two orientations to organizing participation, one (dominant) orientation that privileges “mainstreaming” public housing resident participation into collaborative governance structures and existing market and civil society mechanisms, and another that suggests the continuing need for dedicated mechanisms that maximize public housing representation. In this paper, we frame the theoretical debates over the potential for establishing effective mechanisms to promote deliberative democracy at a neighborhood-level. We then provide an overview of the participatory landscape in these communities, explore how key stakeholders view participation, and examine how the organization of opportunities for deliberation and emerging patterns of

¹University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, Chicago, IL, USA

²Case Western Reserve University, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Cleveland, OH, USA

Corresponding Author:

Robert Chaskin, University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, 969 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, IL 60637
Email: rjc3@uchicago.edu

participation shape dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in these contexts. Based on these findings, we suggest implications for policy and practice.

Keywords

Public housing, mixed-income development, neighborhood governance, democratic participation, deliberation

Public housing has become emblematic of concentrated urban poverty and racial segregation in the United States and elsewhere, including Western Europe, Canada, and Australia. In response to this, a major policy focus over the past two decades across these contexts has been support for housing policies designed to deconcentrate poverty, remake public housing, and promote the development of mixed-income communities in place of the most deteriorated and problematic public housing developments (Atkinson and Kintrea 2000; August 2008; Cisneros and Engdahl 2009; Galster 2007; Joseph 2010; Kearns and Mason 2007; Lees 2008; Musterd and Andersson 2005; Smith 2006a; Kleit 2005). Part of the argument for these policies concerns the promise of *inclusion* and the presumed benefits that should accrue to poor people by integrating them into safe, well-functioning, better served, and better connected neighborhoods (Arthurson 2002; Kearns and Mason 2007; Musterd and Anderson 2005; Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007).

One aspect of inclusion concerns *access* to the resources, institutions, spaces, social arrangements, and opportunities afforded by community residence. Indeed, many of the stated objectives of the HOPE VI legislation, which in the United States has provided the national policy framework for mixed-income development in these contexts, speak directly to integrationist goals focused on reducing isolation and increasing access to institutions (such as good schools), amenities (such as retail and public space), economic opportunity (such as employment), well-functioning public services (such as police), and social interaction within a broader, mixed-income community (HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization 2007, SB829; Popkin et al. 2004; Smith 2006b; Goetz 2000).¹ These integrationist goals, while framed largely in terms of economic opportunity, are also often fundamentally intertwined with race. This is particularly true in the U.S. context, and particularly in Chicago, which is implementing the largest public housing reform program in the country; nearly all public housing residents in Chicago are African-American.

Another aspect of inclusion, though less explicit in the stated policy goals² and receiving less attention in research on mixed-income development,³ concerns *participation* in the deliberative and decision-making processes that

inform policies that affect community members and shape the nature of community life. There are at least two dimensions of participation relevant for considering the nature of inclusion in these mixed-income developments. The first concerns participation in the planning of public housing transformation as a part of the policy development and implementation process. The second concerns participation more broadly in the ongoing civic and associational life of the redeveloped communities. Through these processes, participation might entail contributing to deliberation regarding design, amenities, eligibility, service provision, resource allocation, norms of behavior, rules, relationships, and activities that concern community members.

Regarding the first dimension, expectations for some level of participation in planning and oversight on the part of citizens affected by urban redevelopment interventions have become, since the 1960s in the United States, both normative and, often, codified in legal requirements (O'Connor 1999). In mixed-income developments replacing concentrated public housing complexes, participatory mechanisms to incorporate representation of a range of stakeholders (public housing residents among them) were put in place during both planning and implementation stages as mandated by HOPE IV funding guidelines or negotiated through mobilization and litigation (Wright 2006; Hunt 2009; Poindexter 2000). However, the extent to which these formal mechanisms promote meaningful participation, and particularly the degree to which they effectively represent public housing residents' interests, has been seriously challenged (Wright 2006; Alexander 2009).

In terms of associational life in the redeveloped communities, formal participatory mechanisms created as a part of the mixed-income redevelopment process take their place within a broader ecology of existing and emerging associations and organizations reflective of the kinds of entities that are active in less "contrived" community settings—that is, in neighborhoods not undergoing such wholesale rebuilding and repopulation. These include block clubs, tenant groups, homeowner associations, and neighborhood organizations that in different ways "speak for and act on behalf of" residents around different community issues (Chaskin 2003, 163). But because mixed-income communities replacing public housing developments *are* more contrived—centrally designed and to some extent centrally managed—deliberation and decision making in them are also substantially influenced by development teams and property management, who have a direct role both in "creating" these new communities and in shaping key inputs that will fundamentally condition neighborhood life (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Joseph 2010; Graves 2010).

This article explores the mechanisms, processes, and dynamics of participation and deliberation in three mixed-income communities being built on the footprint of former public housing developments in Chicago. We draw

particular attention to the ways in which deliberative processes largely function without the meaningful participation of relocated public housing residents and other low-income people and to the limited extent such processes serve as effective mechanisms for inclusion and influence in these newly emerging communities.

We begin with a brief examination of some of the theoretical orientations, rationales, and catalysts (including historical precedent) that lie behind participatory orientations for informing policy development and implementation in the context of neighborhood redevelopment efforts. We focus in particular here on theories of collaborative governance, deliberative democracy, and the role of citizen participation in promoting “neighborhood democracy” (Yates 1973). We then outline the basis of the empirical investigation that provides the bulk of our analysis, including the contexts, data, and methods used. The remainder of the article focuses on this empirical case. First, we provide an overview of the participatory landscape, specifying the formal mechanisms and processes that have been put in place to engage and represent public housing residents and situating them within the broader ecology of participatory mechanisms, associations, and organizations that are active in the three communities. Next, we explore how participatory mechanisms are viewed by key development and community stakeholders, including the public officials and professionals involved in the design, build-out, management, and oversight of the mixed-income developments. We then move to an analysis of how the organization of opportunities for deliberation and emerging patterns of participation shape dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in these contexts. Drawing on field observations and the perspectives of both stakeholders and the range of residents (relocated public housing residents,⁴ low-income renters, and higher-income renters and owners) living in the mixed-income developments and engaged in the surrounding neighborhoods, we explore how participatory mechanisms in these contexts work, focusing in particular on the differential roles and (ultimately) influence these arrangements provide.

Participation, Urban Redevelopment, and Neighborhood Democracy

Theories of participatory democracy, efforts to incorporate participation in policy making and implementation, and calls to strengthen civil society (as well as laments about its decline) have proliferated over the past several decades. Critiques of pluralist assumptions that formal democratic governance mechanisms operating in the context of fragmented power and the active engagement of interest groups can govern effectively, legitimately, and

without systematically or permanently excluding minority groups have been widely voiced (Pateman 1970; Judge 1995; Stone 2009). These critiques have led to the development of alternative orientations, including theoretical arguments regarding the benefits of (and possibilities for) more robust processes of deliberation and participation. In addition to arguments about the value of promoting “strong democracy” against the weaknesses of the representative mechanisms and conflict- and interest-oriented assumptions that dominate liberal democratic regimes (e.g., Mansbridge 1980; Barber 1984), these critiques focus on the ways in which power and influence in urban governance (as well as other contexts) in fact operate through a broader set of relational dynamics with actors in and outside of government. Regime theory, for example, focuses on the ways in which governing coalitions are shaped among a range of public, market, and civil society actors to realize collective (if not necessarily unitary) goals through informal collaborative arrangements and the active crafting of cooperation (Stone 1989; Mossberger and Stoker 2001).

Much current discourse builds on regime theory to elaborate the range of ways in which urban areas are governed through relationships among state actors, private interests, and civic networks (Pierre 1999; Melo and Baiocchi 2006). Much of this focuses attention on a shift “from government to governance” (Taylor 2007, 299; Stone 2009, 267) and, in particular, on various forms of public–private partnerships and networked governance structures that are leveraged to drive agenda setting, decision making, resource allocation, and policy implementation. Definitions of governance in this sense vary, from a more narrow focus on “the coordination and fusion of public and private resources” (Pierre 1999, 373) to more inclusive orientations, focusing on “the capacity to integrate and give form to local interests, organizations and social groups and . . . to represent them outside” (Le Galès 1998, cited in Melo and Baiocchi 2006, 592). The development and implementation of the transformation of public housing in Chicago is illustrative of such “new governance” orientations, with a network of local actors from the public and private sectors shaping the broad policy, and specific public–private partnerships playing central roles in its implementation (Pattillo 2007; Alexander 2009).

The extent to which participation (in the “stronger” forms recommended by deliberative democracy schemes) is part of different governance regimes, the range of actors that may be included or excluded, and the mechanisms through which they may be involved varies from place to place, informed by the specific institutional context of a given community (Pierre 1999; Lowndes 2009). In the context of specific reforms (public housing redevelopment and neighborhood regeneration among them), proponents of collaborative governance see in it the potential to promote inclusion by effectively engaging

stakeholders in shaping reform. In this way, collaborative governance is seen to represent an “opening of the political opportunity structure” (Purdue 2001, 2211) and to provide direct access to and influence in shaping policy agendas and responses. However, such efforts may also provide more symbolic than actual forms of power sharing, present the possibility of cooptation, and encounter a broad range of challenges to their representativeness and legitimacy (Alexander 2009; Sirianni 2009).

Recently, there has emerged a set of prescriptive arguments about more effectively shaping governance arrangements in light of the operation of these broader networks and processes, with attendance to the participatory dimension and in accordance with deliberative democratic ideals. This takes different forms. Cohen and Rogers (1995), for example, argue for the encouragement of an “associative democracy” that fosters and supports a range of secondary associations with the capacity and connection to represent minority and disenfranchised interests, and frames institutions that provide opportunities for them to engage in deliberative problem solving. Carmen Sirianni (2009) argues for reshaping governmental institutions—with government operating actively as a “civic enabler”—through formal collaborative arrangements that engage citizens directly in the coproduction of public goods. Archon Fung focuses on institutional design in shaping deliberative mechanisms at the neighborhood level that allow for “a judicious allocation of power, function, and responsibility” (2006, 6) between central authority and local determination through what he calls “accountable autonomy.”

Although such participatory schemes can operate at different scales (Sirianni 2009), in the context of urban redevelopment policies they often have a particular relevance at the neighborhood level, where regeneration efforts are implemented with concrete implications for neighborhood residents on the ground. Indeed, in the United States, much of the impetus for fostering (and later institutionalizing) citizen participation as a necessary component of redevelopment efforts came in response to contention generated by the slum clearance and urban restructuring efforts in the 1950s and 1960s.⁵ Under the federal urban renewal policies of this era, coalitions of local elites in many cities, without the participation or consultation of residents living in urban renewal areas (many of which were African-American communities), chose to privilege central city development and institutional expansion over neighborhood revitalization to benefit current residents (Marris and Rein [1967] 1992; Gans 1962; Haar 1975; Mollenkopf 1983; O’Connor 1999). Unfolding in the broader context of the civil rights movement, these efforts spawned significant protest, as well as new orientations to community planning and development initiatives with an explicit emphasis on citizen participation. In practice, the forums provided

remained a far cry from the ideals suggested by proponents of deliberative democracy, but they did establish a normative expectation and recurring legislative mandates for participation in development programs, however vague those mandates might be and however weak in practice (Rubin 1969; Arnstein 1969; Poindexter 2000). In the context of public housing, however, there were no federal rules requiring tenant consultation until 1979, and these requirements were quite limited.⁶

At the local level in urban areas, the rationale for participation often turns on a set of assumptions about the possibility for “neighborhood democracy” and the benefits of decentralization in response to the failures of centralized, fragmented, unresponsive, and unaccountable government action (Yates 1973). Neighborhoods, in this view, are seen as foundational political units, offering the “possibility of face-to-face interaction, which lies at the heart of the theory of participatory democracy” (Berry, Portney, and Thomson 1993, 10; Barber 1984).

In the context of urban redevelopment schemes, orientations to neighborhood democracy incorporate notions of local knowledge, local rights, and local power (Chaskin and Garg 1997). An emphasis on local knowledge is based on the recognition that local residents represent sources of information and insight unavailable to outside professionals (“street science” in Jason Corburn’s [2005] phrase), and that leveraging this knowledge can be essential for informing more responsive, workable, and sustainable policies (Fung 2006; Sirianni 2009). An emphasis on local rights situates within local communities the basic assumption within democratic societies that individuals have a fundamental right to a meaningful voice regarding issues that affect them (Barber 1984; Young 1990). An emphasis on local power (and “empowerment”) concerns both the assumption that local knowledge and rights will be channeled into deliberative and decision-making forums in meaningful ways—that they will have influence and impact—and that participation in such forums will further build the capacity of community members to be active, effective citizens (Pateman 1970; Chaskin and Garg 1997; Briggs 2008; Sirianni 2009).

Although neighborhoods provide a logical foundation for playing out these ideas in the context of urban renewal strategies, efforts to shape neighborhood governance frameworks are frequently plagued by challenges of legitimacy and accountability that grow out of concerns about representation, process, and capacity. In spite of being habitually invoked as a unitary construct (“the community”), even relatively homogeneous neighborhoods are not monolithic; they incorporate a range of interests, values, priorities, and expectations. Opportunities for and constraints on participation are not uniform, and some residents (homeowners, those with relatively more resources, longer-term

residents) are more likely to engage and be better represented by organizations than others (Crenson 1983; Berry, Portney, and Thomson 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Chaskin 2003). Similarly, institutional interests often have outsized influence on deliberations concerning development, even when citizen review and input is formally structured and operative (Berry, Portney, and Thomson 1993). Even within forums that encourage diverse participation, differences in resources, education, experience, and networks of connection mean that participants often come to the table on less-than-equal terms (Briggs 1998; Chaskin 2005). In the context of many urban neighborhoods (and central to public housing neighborhoods) dynamics around race are likely to further complicate these processes. Thus, general invocations of “community” as a framework for democratic practice and efforts to instantiate it through small-scale direct democracy have important limitations. Given this, Iris Marion Young argues, democratic deliberation and decision-making processes need to explicitly recognize and take into account difference, with guaranteed representation of (disadvantaged) social groups in decision-making processes on policies and activities that affect them (Young 1990).⁷

The neighborhoods being redeveloped in the context of public housing transformation and mixed-income development throw into relief the dynamics of difference in significant, and sometimes stark, ways (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Joseph and Chaskin 2010; Graves 2010; Joseph 2008; Tach 2009). This is true not only because of the intentional attendance to promoting socioeconomic diversity within them, but also because of the highly contentious nature of public housing transformation policy, the historical disadvantage that public housing residents have experienced, and the dynamics of race that are often endemic to these circumstance, especially in cities like Chicago. Given this and (as can be seen later) the fact that initiative designers have not been particularly intentional or attentive to participation issues, shaping inclusive deliberative mechanisms within these contexts is especially complex and challenging.

Context, Data, and Methods

Nowhere in the U.S. has the failure of high-rise, concentrated public housing been more visible than in Chicago. The city has been notorious for corruption and racial divisiveness, and the large-scale development of public housing in the context of urban renewal led to the further segregation and isolation of thousands of African-American families in mismanaged, deteriorating, crime-ridden, high-rise developments. In response to these circumstances, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development took over the management of the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) in 1995. Upon

regaining control of the authority in 1998, then-mayor Richard M. Daley announced his intention to completely remake the physical and social landscape of public housing in the city. This includes the demolition of the vast majority of public housing complexes in the city, the relocation of thousands of CHA families to other neighborhoods using housing vouchers, and the creation of mixed-income developments on the footprint of former public housing complexes. In light of this history, the “Plan for Transformation” has unfolded in a highly politicized and contentious atmosphere, with high levels of criticism and distrust from public housing residents and their advocates, and two high-profile lawsuits (which have since been settled) against the CHA to delay and modify the process. Adding to the complexity, Chicago is implementing mixed-income development on a scale far greater than anything previously attempted in the country, with well over 16,000 units planned in 10 major developments around the city (CHA 2008).

The analysis that follows is based on in-depth interviews, field observations, and a review of documentary data concerning three mixed-income developments that are part of CHA’s Plan for Transformation (see Table 1). Oakwood Shores is the development taking the place of Ida B. Wells/Madden Park, one of the oldest public housing developments in the nation that, unlike many of the public housing complexes being replaced by mixed-income developments, was a low-rise and midrise development. It will be the second largest of the new developments in the city. Park Boulevard is being built in place of Stateway Gardens, a collection of eight high-rise buildings that was constructed as part of the “State Street Corridor,” an area that had some of the highest poverty concentration levels in the entire country, which also included the 28 high-rise towers of the Robert Taylor homes. Both Oakwood Shores and Park Boulevard are located south of the city’s central business district (the Loop) in an area often referred to as Bronzeville which, like New York’s Harlem, has an important historical legacy as being the economic, political, and cultural center of African-American life in Chicago. This larger neighborhood has been the focus of substantial development interest from private, public, and philanthropic actors over the past two decades and includes several gentrifying areas.

Westhaven Park is the second phase of the redevelopment of Henry Horner Homes, the first phase of which started prior to the Plan for Transformation. Units produced in this initial, pre-Transformation phase are only for public housing residents, so ultimately the new development will have a larger proportion of relocated public housing residents than any other site. The site is located on Chicago’s Near West Side, about 3 miles west of the Loop. The broader neighborhood in which the development sits has also been the target of significant development interests over the past two decades, a number of which have been contentious, leading to community mobilization to influence the shape of such development, such as the

Table 1. Mixed-Income Developments^a

	Oakwood Shores	Park Boulevard	Westhaven Park
Former public housing site	Ida B. Wells/Madden Park	Stateway Gardens	Henry Horner Homes
Total projected units	3,000	1,316	1,317
Relocated public housing units, <i>n</i> (%)	1,000 (33%)	439 (33%)	824 ^b (63%)
Affordable units, <i>n</i> (%)	680 (23%)	421 (32%)	132 (10%)
Market-rate units, <i>n</i> (%)	1,320 (44%)	456 (35%)	361 (27%)
% For sale	27%	42%	23%
Social service providers	Nonprofit, delivered by developer	Nonprofit, created by developer	Nonprofit, contracted out to local organizations
Developer(s)	National nonprofit (rental); local for-profit (for sale)	Four local for-profits	Two regional and national for-profits
Guiding legal authority for returning residents	Relocation Rights Contract	Relocation Rights Contract	Consent decree
Neighborhood	North Kenwood Oakland, Southside Chicago	Bronzeville, Southside Chicago	Near West Side Westside Chicago
Neighborhood amenities and institutions	Near Lake Michigan, public parks, Hyde Park, and Univ. of Chicago	Near public transit corridor, IL Institute of Technology, White Sox stadium, major highway	Near downtown central business district, public transit stop, United Center

a. Numbers and percentages represent development plans as of 2011.

b. Includes off-site, scattered-site units and the Villages, a "superblock" of 100% public housing residences located in the middle of the mixed-income development.

building of a new sports arena that led ultimately to a negotiated agreement that included construction of replacement housing for homeowners who would be displaced (von Hoffman 2003). Furthermore, all redevelopment at Horner Homes is governed by a consent decree, to be discussed in more

detail below, that is the result of a successful class-action lawsuit brought against the CHA (Wilén 2006).

A total of 225 interviews were conducted over two waves of data collection (conducted approximately 18 months apart in 2007 and 2008–2009, respectively), including panels of both resident and professional stakeholder key informants. Resident interviewees were randomly selected from developer occupancy lists in each site and included residents of different housing tenures, including 35 relocated public housing residents, 25 residents of “affordable” units (either rented or owned, subsidized by tax credits), and 25 residents of “market-rate” units (again, either rented or owned). While owners of “affordable” units are largely middle class, renters of tax-credit units closely resemble relocated public housing residents demographically—low income, African-American, with low levels of educational attainment. Most residents were interviewed twice over the course of the two waves of data collection, but because the pace of occupancy was delayed in Park Boulevard at the time of the first wave of fieldwork, resident interviews from Park Boulevard are only available for the second wave. In addition, at Park Boulevard, the only renters are relocated public housing residents.

Professional stakeholder key informants included a total of 66 individuals involved in some way in the Transformation, either as “development team” members (developers, service providers, and property managers), as “community stakeholders” (such as service providers, community activists, and public officials active in the neighborhoods in which these developments are being built), or as “macro-level” actors—participants and active observers operating at the city level in connection with the Transformation (including officials with the CHA and public housing advocates).

Interviews were guided by a semistructured instrument, recorded digitally and transcribed in their entirety, and coded for analysis based on a set of deductively derived thematic codes and refined based on inductive interim analysis. Data from 420 observations of community meetings, programs, events, and interactions allow us to contextualize interview data within the specific dynamics of each site and capture deliberation and community-building processes as they unfolded in private and public group settings. We observed the operations of governance mechanisms described in this analysis over a three-year period during which residents were moving into the new units, while at the same time the predevelopment planning processes for future phases was still occurring. Field notes were coded for analysis, and for groups that meet periodically we also synthesized field notes into narrative memos that described the content, participation, and changing dynamics at these meetings over time. Coding focused on a range of issues concerning participation and decision making both in the mixed-income developments and in the broader neighborhoods. These

included thematic codes on the range and nature of mechanisms (both formal and informal) that provide participatory opportunities; on the goals and rationale behind participatory mechanisms; on the nature and extent of participation and engagement among different residents; on participatory dynamics, challenges, and outcomes (such as issues of legitimacy, representation, and influence); and on the nature of resident integration in the developments and the broader neighborhoods. Coding and analysis was done using NVivo qualitative data-analysis software. Interviews were initially double-coded to ensure interrater reliability, and then a periodic sample of coded interviews (every fifth transcript) was reviewed to ensure continued reliability. Summary matrices of responses were created to allow for systematic comparison of perspectives across interviewee type as defined by housing tenure, income level, professional stakeholder status, and the development site. Given the timing of the data collection, the findings primarily concern the post-redevelopment stage when the public housing buildings had been torn down and the newly constructed mixed-income developments were first occupied.

The Participatory Landscape

Mechanisms to incorporate resident participation in deliberation about neighborhood priorities include both those put in place by legislative mandate to provide for the participation of public housing residents in the implementation of the Transformation as well as a range of associational mechanisms that existed prior to or emerged during the early implementation of the mixed-income developments. In mapping this terrain, we highlight the most influential predevelopment and postoccupancy mechanisms and compare differences in the structure, function, and relative strength of different groups in each of the three sites. Of particular concern here are those associations that influence (promote or constrain) the participation and influence of relocated public housing residents in deliberative decision-making processes affecting community priorities and decisions regarding design, amenities, roles, and expectations for neighborhood norms and development goals.

Statutory Mechanisms for the Inclusion of Public Housing Residents

There are several official mechanisms that govern participation of public housing residents and other stakeholders in decision making about the development of mixed-income communities in each site (see Table 2). Participation of public housing residents in dedicated deliberative processes has evolved over the past

Table 2. Statutory Mechanisms for Public Housing Resident Participation

Description	History and Authority	Function and Issues	Roles, Participation, and Representation	Decision-Making Processes
<p>Working Groups Principal collaborative mechanism to oversee implementation of mixed-income developments</p>	<p>Starting in 1996, HUD required housing authorities to engage public housing residents affected by relocation in redevelopment planning. In 2000, CHA established Working Groups at sites undergoing mixed-income redevelopment as a way to involve CHA residents and local communities in the redevelopment process.</p>	<p>Working Groups are charged with selecting developers, planning and overseeing redevelopment, and establishing eligibility criteria for returning families. Typical agenda items include redevelopment plans and progress, property management issues, service delivery, and neighborhood concerns (e.g., security).</p>	<p>Membership is tightly controlled and includes two former LAC members, two community representatives, city and elected officials, and representatives charged with overseeing the city-wide redevelopment process (e.g., legal counsel, court-ordered receiver). Meetings are facilitated by CHA staff.</p>	<p>Rules guiding decision making state that all decisions should be made by consensus. Where consensus cannot be reached, CHA has final say.</p>
<p>Local Advisory Councils (LACs) Democratically elected resident councils at traditional public housing developments</p>	<p>Federal legislation (1968) and HUD (1971) administrative rules authorized resident councils to engage residents to comment on policy, management, and planning processes. LACs established by mid-1970s at all public housing sites in Chicago. After redevelopment, LACs were not reestablished at mixed-income sites.</p>	<p>LACs work on issues of management, security, services, and other development policies. CHA provides funding, office space, and skills training for elected LAC leadership. The presidents of individual LACs are members of the Central Advisory Council (CAC), which negotiates systemwide issues with the CHA.</p>	<p>Resident leaders are elected by residents every three years. Public housing residents in mixed-income communities no longer vote for LAC leadership; however, two LAC members from the former developments serve on each of the mixed-income Working Groups.</p>	<p>LACs function differently at each public housing site. In general, elected resident leaders set agendas for the CAC and hold regular meetings for all residents.</p>
<p>Office of the Ombudsman Represents mixed-income public housing residents</p>	<p>In 2008, CHA was granted a waiver of federal regulations to establish an alternate mechanism</p>	<p>The Office of the Ombudsman provides individual mediation around lease</p>	<p>This new form of representation applies only to public housing residents who live in</p>	<p>The Ombudsman works cooperatively with CHA and development</p>

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Description	History and Authority	Function and Issues	Roles, Participation, and Representation	Decision-Making Processes
	for the representation of public housing residents in mixed-income developments in lieu of forming resident councils.	violations, neighbor-to-neighbor conflicts, and service provision. They host biannual meetings for residents to pose questions and comments to CHA and development representatives.	mixed-income developments. Residents can access the Office of the Ombudsman on their own or through referral from service providers or development officials.	officials to resolve specific concerns and mediate complaints on behalf of residents.
Horner Residents Council (HRC) Resident body established by court to oversee redevelopment at Horner/Westhaven Park	In 1991, Henry Horner's Mothers Guild initiated legal action against the CHA to ensure better housing through rehabbed or rebuilt units. In 1995, the HRC was established by the courts to guarantee that public housing residents have direct representation into redevelopment decisions at the Horner/Westhaven Park site.	HRC is charged with approving decisions about the redevelopment process and some operations of the new mixed-income site. HRC has been influential in decisions about tenant eligibility for housing, requirements for tenant services, contractors' selection, and specific tenant grievances.	Membership includes nine resident representatives and legal counsel. Most representatives live in traditional public housing located in proximity to the new mixed-income development site; a few reside at Westhaven Park.	CHA and the Westhaven Park developer must seek approval from HRC before making major decisions pertaining to public housing residents. In the event that HRC and CHA cannot reach agreement on an issue, either side can petition to the courts for remedy.

40 years. In the context of widespread urban unrest, the growing force of the civil rights movement, and the political mobilization of growing numbers of African-American city-dwellers (public housing tenants among them) in the 1960s, federal legislation responded in part by requiring that democratically elected resident councils be established locally as mechanisms for tenant representation (Hunt 2009). In Chicago, Local Advisory Councils (LACs) were established by the mid-1970s at all developments and a system was established for residents at each site to elect representatives. The LACs were organized into a Central Advisory Council (CAC) made up of the leadership of all LACs

(Hunt 2009).⁸ The influence and effectiveness of the LACs varied widely by development and individual leaders, but in general the bodies served to raise pressing tenant issues with the CHA and in some cases provided a platform for LAC leaders to secure employment and other benefits for themselves and their network of supporters (Venkatesh 2000; Hunt 2009). More recently, under the guidelines governing HOPE VI grants provided to local housing authorities, HUD requires that processes be put in place for public housing residents affected by relocation to engage with other community stakeholders in the redevelopment planning processes. A basic mechanism to inform community members and provide (limited) opportunity for input has been a series of public comment hearings held by the CHA both at the outset of the Plan for Transformation and on an ongoing basis either citywide or at the various redevelopment sites. To facilitate more structured, ongoing deliberation and decision making, the CHA created Working Groups at each mixed-income site as the principal collaborative governance mechanism to inform design and oversee implementation, including selecting developers, planning redevelopment, and establishing eligibility criteria for returning families (CHA 2000). CHA policy currently allows for two LAC leaders to serve on each of the Working Groups, providing the main mechanism through which public housing residents have been represented. The status of the LACs themselves, however, has changed. Although remaining traditional public housing developments (of which more than 10 remain in Chicago) still have operating LACs, in 2008 the CHA requested a waiver of federal regulations in order to establish “an alternate mechanism” to facilitate representation of relocated public housing residents who had moved into mixed-income developments (CHA 2008). In place of the elected LACs in these sites, the CHA established the Office of the Ombudsman at its central offices downtown, which mediates and responds to residents’ concerns pertaining to their housing experience.

In most sites, the Working Groups and recourse to the Ombudsman are the only formal mechanisms specifically established to provide the opportunity for relocated public housing residents to participate in deliberations and express their concerns. In Westhaven Park, however, a lawsuit by the Henry Horner’s Mother’s Guild led to a consent decree that established the Horner Residents Council (HRC) to guarantee that public housing residents have direct representation through a group of resident representatives and engagement of the Horner legal counsel in decisions about the redevelopment process and the new mixed-income site (Alexander 2009; Wilen 2006).

At a formal level, these mechanisms—established through legislation, administrative policies, and legal authority—provide forums for relocated public housing residents’ interests concerning the development and implementation of local aspects of the Plan for Transformation to be represented.

Operating in the context of “collaborative governance,” they structure participation in ways that provide some (differential) opportunity for representation of stakeholder groups, while limiting the level and nature of resident influence, the dynamics of which will be explored below. These mechanisms, however, exist within a broader context of associational action both in the developments and in the broader neighborhoods of which they are a part.

Associational Mechanisms in and Beyond the Developments

Associational mechanisms in these contexts vary regarding their purpose, history, constituencies served, nature of participation, mechanisms for decision making, and relationships (see Table 3). We have grouped these structures into different types, based on similarities regarding their relationship to the development and the broader neighborhood surrounding the site and by the catalyzing actors and events that established them.

Development governance. First, there are mechanisms that have been established by developers, property managers, and service providers. Examples include management-run meetings held for renters to provide input on building concerns, projects facilitated by service providers to engage in “building community” among residents (such as a tenant-led security watch committee), and owners’ associations established through the development partnerships that transfer governance over to unit owners as required under condominium law. At Westhaven Park and Park Boulevard, the developers are represented as voting members in those associations for the buildings in which they own units that are made available for renters.

In addition, aspects of development governance are implemented by community-based organizations contracted by development partnerships across sites to implement case management and employment services, as well as some community-building initiatives aimed at increasing the capacity of residents to organize collectively. Westhaven Park contracts with a local nonprofit community development corporation; Oakwood Shores offers “community life” services delivered directly by the nonprofit housing developer. At Park Boulevard, a new nonprofit organization, Stateway Community Partners (SCP),⁹ was established in the predevelopment phase to serve the new owners and relocated public housing residents who would move into the site.

Emerging neighborhood associations. New associational mechanisms have also emerged as residents move in and organize themselves into groups with the intent to influence the decisions of external actors. Informal networks of residents have also emerged, brought together in response to shared interests or concerns, though these networks have not always developed into more

Table 3. Associational Mechanisms in and beyond the Mixed-Income Developments

Type	Description	Function and Issues	Roles, Participation, and Representation	Decision-Making Processes
<p>Development governance Established by development stakeholders for residents of the mixed-income developments</p>	<p>Renter meetings Monthly or quarterly meetings sponsored by property managers to discuss property concerns with renters.</p> <p>Homeowner associations Primary role of condo and homeowner associations is to manage and maintain the for-sale property. Also protect the financial interests of owners.</p> <p>Nonprofit organizations operating at developments Contracted to offer supportive services to relocated renters and other residents.</p>	<p>Managers communicate rules and expectations for appropriate behavior. Renters offer suggestions and feedback. Issues discussed include lease compliance, security, and maintenance.</p> <p>Associations focus on pertinent property issues relating to maintenance, security, rules, and financial stability. Some associations have focused on broader neighborhood issues (e.g., working with police to increase patrols). These organizations coordinate services and activities for the resident population (e.g., employment training, youth activities, and clinical referrals).</p>	<p>Property managers facilitate meetings. Attendance is higher among relocated public housing residents than other renters. Associations are legally composed of all owners and represented by an elected board. Some developers have voting rights due to ownership of rental or unsold units. One association allows attendance by two renter representatives.</p> <p>Led by boards composed of leaders of neighborhood-based institutions, political officials, and business owners. Residents do not have a strong role in leadership in these organizations.</p>	<p>Residents typically raise individual needs and concerns, and managers follow up as necessary. Decisions are made through deliberative discussion and voting by board members. Organizations offer individual services and group activities. Typically, these activities are not designed to engage residents in decision-making processes.</p>
<p>Neighborhood associations Formed by residents of the mixed-income developments</p>	<p>Emerging associations Created to address community needs of residents living in the mixed-income development and surrounding neighborhood.</p>	<p>Residents work collectively to address development and neighborhood issues (e.g., business development, youth leadership, and safety and security).</p>	<p>Residents lead through elected and appointed positions. Participation in individual associations is typically segregated by tenure.</p>	<p>Meetings are managed by agenda, and attendees brainstorm and decide on action as a group.</p>

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Type	Description	Function and Issues	Roles, Participation, and Representation	Decision-Making Processes
Existing neighborhood structures led by community-based organizations or public institutions	<p>Neighborhood-based organizations and public processes</p> <p>Neighborhood associations and CBOs represent the interests of residents and businesses in the neighborhood.</p> <p>Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS)</p> <p>Local neighborhood channels where citizens have direct access to police to address safety concerns.</p>	<p>Majority of associations focus on promoting residential and commercial investment. Issues focus on security, real estate and retail development, and neighborhood amenities.</p> <p>Officers share crime statistics and community alerts for the local area.</p> <p>Residents communicate concerns, ranging from quality of life issues (loitering, curfew, noise) to more serious offenses (gangs, drug use, criminal activity) and police responses.</p>	<p>Associations are led by a board of elected or appointed leaders that meet regularly. Open meetings and events elicit broader participation from a diverse population of residents. Meetings are facilitated by appointed community residents. Participation varies based on location and time of year. Typically draw mix of renters and owners.</p>	<p>Decision-making processes vary, though most occur in private sessions rather than public meetings.</p> <p>Vary by meeting. Residents are encouraged to share information with each other, and some facilitators and officers lead participants in community strategizing.</p>

formal associations (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Chaskin and Joseph 2011). At Oakwood Shores, for example, in response to developer efforts to organize owners and renters to work together in an inclusive neighborhood association, the Bronzeville Oakland Neighborhood Association (BONA) was established almost entirely by renters. At Westhaven Park, Neighbors' Development Network (NDN) was launched by a group of owners who united around concerns about safety and public behavior, though it has evolved to focus as well on fostering participation of youth and families in activities such as a running club, community gardens, and a farmers market.

Neighborhood-based organizations and public processes. Beyond these examples, which largely focus on residents living within the mixed-income development, there is a larger group of associations and neighborhood-based organizations that have long influenced the climate of citizen participation

in these largely African-American communities. These include nonprofit community organizations, citizen action groups, block clubs, and merchant associations that are typical of other Chicago neighborhoods. There are also forums facilitated by municipal institutions aiming to engage citizens in the planning and delivery of services such as community policing forums, parks advisory committees, local school councils, neighborhood planning boards, and ward committees. Community Alternative Policing (CAPS) meetings, for example, provide a forum where citizens have direct access to police and other stakeholders in efforts to address safety concerns and are an example of the kinds of institutional mechanisms that Fung (2006) credits with the potential for shaping effective participatory democracy and “accountable autonomy.” Residents and police meet to discuss crime, security strategies, police responses, and expectations for suitable behavior in the neighborhood, primarily in shared public spaces such as parks. Given that the mixed-income sites are major forces in the redevelopment of these neighborhoods, these organizations are often significantly engaged in seeking to influence neighborhood decisions and actors.

The neighborhoods surrounding the developments also have central planning bodies, associations, and political wards that existed prior to the redevelopment and that, predictably, influence how new and relocated public housing residents participate in shaping neighborhood dynamics. At Oakwood Shores, for example, the North Kenwood Oakland Conservation Community Council (NKO-CCC) has statutory authority as the governing body over a conservation district directly adjacent to the site, allowing community residents to work with city planners to advise on housing and commercial development. At Westhaven Park, a long-established community development corporation, the Near West Side Community Development Corporation, has been a significant player in neighborhood planning and resident advocacy for decades. And at Park Boulevard, an educational institution adjacent to the site and an active citizens’ association contribute to neighborhood amenity planning processes such as a new grocery store, park and recreation center, and an elementary school.

Stakeholder Orientations toward Representation and Participation

Although there was, with only a few exceptions, general agreement that developers, property managers, services providers, housing authority officials, and leaders of community-based organizations all have some role in generating opportunities for relocated public housing residents to have voice in decision-making processes, perspectives on the purpose and value of input

and on appropriate strategies to include these residents varied. The perspectives explored below emerged inductively from the analysis of observation and interview data. About half of professional stakeholder respondents in our sample across categories (development team members, community stakeholders, and macro-level actors) had specific perspectives on the rationale for participation of relocated public housing residents and opinions about the most effective ways to promote it. Regarding purpose and rationale, perspectives fell into three categories: information sharing, capacity building, and influence.

Information sharing as a rationale for participation was the least common focus among those with specific opinions about these issues, with only about 15% of professional stakeholders elaborating on this as a rationale. In spite of this, the forums that most regularly incorporate participation of relocated public housing residents are largely focused on sharing information, though more *to* rather than *from* residents. These generally take the shape of meetings between property management and renters—especially low-income and relocated public housing residents—the focus of which is largely on hearing about issues of resident concern and clarifying issues about rules and responsibilities, under the guiding assumption that relocated public housing residents need to learn how to live responsibly in these new, private-market housing environments. Indeed, rather than seeking to benefit from “local knowledge” to inform actions to be taken by development teams, development stakeholders were more likely to focus on the need for relocated public housing residents to be clear on development rules and develop knowledge of neighborhood resources. This includes both service resources—job training, counseling, educational opportunities and the like—and opportunities for broader participation in neighborhood deliberation. At Oakwood Shores and Westhaven Park, for example, development stakeholders sought to reduce barriers to participation in CAPS forums by hosting meetings at the development site.

A focus on participation as an avenue toward *capacity building* for relocated public housing residents was more common among these respondents, focused on by about 35% of them. Principally, this concerns the need for public housing residents to develop knowledge, skills, and experience in order to participate on more equal terms with their higher-income neighbors. Stakeholders were particularly focused on the need for residents to learn *how* to effectively participate in existing neighborhood forums, particularly regarding different communication and organizing styles than those used in (some of) the Local Advisory Councils, some of which were known for a combative style. Instead, these stakeholders described the need for relocated public housing residents to develop skills to work within existing

mechanisms, reflecting the accepted standards of participation expected by higher-income residents, housing authority officials, and developers, all of whom are in positions of power.

A focus on shaping opportunities for *influence* in development and neighborhood decision making was the most common rationale elaborated, emphasized by about 40% of these respondents. Perspectives on the nature of influence and the appropriate strategies of inclusion, however, varied widely. Some believe that relocated public housing residents should be engaged *directly*, through one forum or another, with elected officials, public institutions, and neighborhood planning processes (such as attending ward meetings or volunteering on local advisory councils of the parks and schools) in order to participate in political agenda-setting and shape priorities for neighborhood investment and action. Others focus on the role that representative structures, such as the Working Groups, should play to broker influence *on behalf of* relocated public housing residents, suggesting that relocated public housing residents should have explicit representation in order to influence decisions in these new contexts.

Regardless of how such respondents framed the rationale for participation, however, an overarching orientation among them concerned the need to “mainstream” relocated public housing residents into existing mechanisms through which other neighborhood residents get information, share their perspectives, and contribute to collective deliberation about priorities and concerns. Although a minority of these stakeholders (less than 20%) discussed the importance of ensuring that specific mechanisms exist to represent the *particular* concerns of relocated public housing residents, the vast majority of them (nearly 80%) argued for mainstreaming relocated public housing residents into existing neighborhood associational mechanisms rather than perpetuating division and isolation by maintaining separate participatory mechanisms for relocated public housing residents. This was most clearly elaborated in particular by CHA staff and by developers responsible for managing the developments. As a senior CHA staff member put it:

The whole idea behind the Plan for Transformation was that if you’ve got a public housing subsidy you shouldn’t have a scarlet letter on your vest. . . . So I feel in the mixed-income developments, that eventually they should become like neighborhoods and that representation should be like neighborhoods. So if they’re going to have community groups, or neighborhood organizations, or block clubs and have leadership and have organizations they should have that, but they shouldn’t have something separate in a mixed-income neighborhood for public housing residents in the long run.

The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion

Given these orientations on the part of professional stakeholders responsible, in large part, for shaping (or at least facilitating) participatory opportunities in these communities, and given the range of mechanisms and opportunities for participation that are available, how do patterns of participation and influence shape dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in these contexts? To answer this question, we investigate how the organization of opportunities for participation informs decision-making processes and explore the relative influence among different community members these arrangements promote.

Organization and Compartmentalization

The very organization of participatory opportunities has an influence on the nature, level, and impact of resident participation. Criteria for group membership, for example, tend in these contexts to promote participation among residents of similar housing backgrounds (owners, renters, and relocated public housing residents) while reflecting and reproducing differences between such groups. Formal statutory mechanisms—established through legislation, administrative policies, and legal authority—structure participation in ways that provide some limited opportunities for relocated public housing residents to be at least formally represented, while significantly controlling the degree and nature of residents' influence. In addition, the wide array of neighborhood-based associational mechanisms provides in practice extremely limited opportunities for relocated public housing residents and other renters to participate in them given their typical orientation to homeowner and institutional interests. The ways in which these structures are organized and operate differ somewhat across sites.

Statutory mechanisms. As previously described, Working Groups were established to facilitate the representation of various community and institutional stakeholders in the redevelopment process, including relocated public housing residents through their (former) LAC leaders. Given the dismantling of LACs in the mixed-income sites, however, the representative function of these leaders is less than straightforward.¹⁰ Complicating matters further, in the Westhaven Park and Oakwood Shores Working Groups, the resident representatives on the Working Groups are also now employees of the CHA, the city, or one of the CHA-contracted services providers. This compromises the ability of these resident leaders to represent the interests of residents given the complex realities of their multiple roles, responsibilities, commitments, and potentially competing interests. At Park Boulevard, there are a few

relocated public housing residents who attend Working Group meetings who are not also employed by CHA or a service contractor, but their participation is minimal compared to other members, in part because meeting agendas have little dedicated space for resident feedback. Thus, rather than a forum for residents to engage in the redevelopment planning process, these mechanisms now function largely as coordinating forums where development professionals and public officials share information about upcoming development phases, applications for financing, progress toward service goals, and the status of leasing and tenant occupancy. Although the Working Groups differ substantially across the three sites in terms of the extent of deliberation among resident leaders, CHA officials, and other stakeholders, these forums provide little room for significant resident influence on actual decision making. The Park Boulevard Working Group generally has the most reporting-oriented meetings with some questioning and clarification but little open brainstorming or deliberative decision making. At Oakwood Shores, the Working Group meetings are often over three hours long, with extensive conversations about concerns at the site, but it is unclear to what extent those discussions result in influencing decisions for the development team and the CHA. The Westhaven Park Working Group is required by the consent decree to establish a clear consensus on major decisions, but given no other alternative, relocated public housing residents rely on LAC leaders and legal counsel to represent their interests. They are not allowed to vote, however, and are not formally represented by these leaders, given the new CHA policies disallowing LACs in mixed-income developments.

Professional stakeholders vary in their perspectives regarding Working Group representation. Some (like those at Park Boulevard) argue that resident inclusion on the Working Groups strengthens residents' voice and influence; others (such as those at Oakwood Shores) suggest that other Working Group members (who are not necessarily relocated public housing residents) are in fact acting with the interests of relocated public housing residents in mind, so direct participation is unnecessary. At all three sites, as the Working Groups have begun to focus more and more on issues of promoting constructive neighbor relations in the increasingly populated developments, the idea of including residents (including owners and affordable or market-rate renters) directly on the Working Groups has been discussed. While such a move may increase the diversity of resident representation, it will likely further *decrease* the influence of relocated public housing residents.

In Westhaven Park, other statutory mechanisms also exist, and they are more relevant in shaping the opportunities for relocated public housing residents to be represented. Here, the HRC and the Horner LAC, backed by legal

representation and the terms of the consent decree, provide public housing residents with more leverage than in other sites to engage with developers, property managers, service providers, elected officials, housing authority executives, and neighborhood association leaders. They have, for example, effectively influenced decisions about tenant screening, work requirements for tenants, future development phases, and security measures. As a community stakeholder notes:

[In] most of the other mixed-income [developments], the Working Group decides what to do when, you know, and the public housing residents and reps are just one member of the Working Group. Here, we have a federal court order that says you've got to sit down and talk to the residents and figure out what to do and if you can't reach an agreement you come to [the lawyer representing public housing residents under the consent decree]. That's—that's a pretty big stick.

In contrast to Westhaven Park, the opportunities for relocated public housing residents to participate and be represented in formal mechanisms have played out much differently at the other two sites. Development and community stakeholders at Oakwood Shores and Park Boulevard almost universally agree with the dismantling of the LACs. As noted above, this rationale is grounded in assumptions about the value of “mainstreaming” relocated public housing residents into the market and civil society. According to a community stakeholder from Park Boulevard:

LACs kind of contradict the reality of mixed-income development. If the objective is to get people to begin to function as a community, then you can't have a thing that exists that constantly says, you're public housing, you're public housing, you're public housing, entitled to different rights. And you're different, you're different, you're different. And as long as you have that, you can never achieve true community building.

However, residents' previous history with the LACs serves as a basis for how they interpret the new decision-making processes. In spite of the dismantling of the formal LAC structure, relationships between some relocated public housing residents and LAC leaders remain. Indeed, the framework of the LAC remains crucial to the ways that residents interpret their rights and the strategies for representation in the new context of mixed-income development. As a relocated public housing resident at Oakwood Shores put it:

[The old LAC leaders and residents] basically have meetings because actually the promise came from Ida B. Wells of what we're supposed to receive here so we're still holding them very well accountable to this promise. . . . Some of the residents might not know how to go about it but I still know how to go about using the resources to keep [the developer and property management] in line here.

In spite of some continued connections between former LAC leaders and current residents (about half of our respondents indicate that they continue to have contact with the LAC leaders through informal activities), however, representatives of relocated public housing residents are a small minority on the Working Groups, which are dominated by other stakeholders. Further, given the ambiguity surrounding the relationship between these resident representatives and the broader population on whose behalf they speak, as well as contestation over the nature and value of the Ombudsman, the relative influence of relocated public housing residents in addressing their concerns and priorities is limited.

Neighborhood associational mechanisms. As noted above, these formal mechanisms operate in the larger context of a range of other associations that represent different resident interests and are organized around different community concerns. To a large extent, these associations organize residents in ways that compartmentalize participation, often by housing tenure. The number and relative influence of these multiple mechanisms tend to further overshadow the influence of relocated public housing and other low-income residents in these contexts, with the partial exception of relocated public housing residents at Westhaven Park who are represented through the Horner Residents Council.

Development teams, community stakeholders, and homeowners across all three sites described homeowner associations as critical mechanisms for owners to organize around shared interests and make collective demands. Owners, particularly at Westhaven Park, have been effective in instituting security measures (surveillance cameras, CHA-funded security services), organizing campaigns for better amenities (grocery stores, community gardens, parks), and gaining the attention of public officials through public meetings and letter-writing campaigns, particularly around safety concerns. Their influence is supported by the clarity of representation such associations provide, the strong expectations owners hold for the new neighborhood, and the nature of their claims making, which resonates with developers and institutional players. As one community stakeholder at Park Boulevard suggests:

There are condo associations but these folk are coming in with a different kind of agenda, different way of getting stuff done based on their environment and their history, their core, their community. They're business oriented and that's what was kind of lacking before but now this is what's good. . . . You have a corporate way of doing things and making accountability.

The organization of homeowners stands in stark contrast to the situation with renters. Beyond the very limited representation of relocated public housing residents on Working Groups and, somewhat indirectly, on the Horner Residents Council at Westhaven Park, there are no renters' associations at any site. At Oakwood Shores and Park Boulevard, in particular, relocated public housing residents and other renters expressed concerns about this lack of organization, but it is felt even at Westhaven Park where there is court-ordered representation. According to a development stakeholder there:

I think they don't feel like they really have an outlet. . . . [T]he only place they would have to go and complain to would be the site manager. That's it. There is no renters association. Like, there's a condo association but there is no renter's association so they don't meet. . . . If you had a renter's association that would speak for them and those groups talked then they could share information back to their groups. But with the [relocated] people, you don't have that. They don't have anybody, they're just out.

This lack of participatory "outlet" is also felt by low-income renters in tax-credit (affordable) units. As noted above, these residents are quite similar to relocated public housing residents demographically (e.g., in terms of income, race, and education) but lack the access to the market that higher income renters have. Indeed, while few market-rate renters expressed awareness of, time for, or interest in participating in such forums in general (with the exception of CAPS meetings)—either because they view their presence in the community as likely to be quite temporary or because they see the meetings they hear about as unimportant or not "for them"—renters of subsidized units who were not relocated public housing residents were often concerned about the participatory opportunities for renters in general. As one at Westhaven Park put it:

[Relocated public housing residents] have a resident council. . . . And then the other people that live here, as far as people on Section 8, and I'm on Section 8, and people who pay full rent, we don't have anything. . . . Any kind of power base, nothing, no council.

In lieu of such outlets, site-based renters' meetings provide the principal opportunity for all renters to convene and discuss issues, but these are facilitated and managed by staff from the development, who set the terms of deliberation. Renters' response to these forums was overwhelmingly negative, as almost all perceive that these forums lack opportunities for deliberation and do not result in meaningful outcomes. Indeed, a priority focus of these meetings, convened and led by property managers, is on communicating to renters—and particularly to tax-credit and relocated public housing residents—their responsibilities as tenants such as expectations regarding maintenance of the unit, requirements for yearly lease renewals, and the need to engage in appropriate “neighborly behavior.” According to respondents, there is little attention to and follow-up action on resident concerns. We have observed residents' discontent directly, for example, in meetings where residents express frustration about the lack of responsiveness by managers who appear to disregard their comments. As a relocated public housing resident at Oakwood Shores put it:

I know they asked for our opinions in the meeting, but I don't think they really take it to heart or whatever. . . . I think they gonna do what they want to do anyway. You know they might say well we want to know your ideas and everything, but . . . they're not really paying attention. I think they just saying it just to say it. And they still have the last decision.

Beyond these mechanisms, most neighborhood-based organizations and public processes have not engaged renters at all, and there has been limited integration of residents living in the mixed-income developments into them. Indeed, rather than incorporation, conflict is more common. For example, one organization campaigned to limit the number of subsidized affordable housing units in the neighborhood (raising concerns for some of the relocated public housing residents), while another association sought to reestablish a parks advisory committee (which received mixed reactions from both new owners and relocated public housing residents). In Westhaven Park, differences between the leaders of existing neighborhood organizations and the new owners led to intervention from the city's Human Relations Board in order to facilitate dialogue around conflicting agendas.

The major exception in terms of participation in neighborhood mechanisms is the CAPS meetings, which often draw residents from across income groups and housing tenure to engage in deliberation around issues of community safety. These forums, however, while promoting relatively broad

participation, also frequently generate significant conflict, as will be explored in the next section.

Relative Influence and the Dynamics of Contention

This organization of representation helps shape a context of differential participation and influence among different resident groups, with the interests of homeowners and key institutions (developers, the CHA) given priority. The majority of relocated public housing residents (as well as other low-income residents) interviewed at Oakwood Shores and Park Boulevard, in particular, expressed concern about the processes in place to provide them with a voice in decision making and expressed caution about sharing their opinions, given the unknown terrain of living in privatized housing and uncertainty about how to engage with staff and owners. As a relocated public housing resident at Park Boulevard put it:

All I can say about over here is . . . we all have a voice, but the authority [is] new and they're trying to get everything together. . . . I'm just holding back. . . . I'm holding back till I'm ready to say what I want to say.

Indeed, most professional stakeholders also recognize that owners' interests are more influential. As a development stakeholder at Westhaven Park put it:

The opportunities are not also given to CHA residents. That's the reason I say they're getting screwed as well. . . . Nobody is speaking for them, but somebody is speaking for the homeowners.

In spite of this recognition, there are mixed opinions about how—or how important it is—to effectively change this reality. In the words of a community stakeholder and former public housing resident at Westhaven Park:

We know really those who pay make the rules. That's being real about it. Those who have the money are the ones with the power. I mean [public housing residents] have some influence because we've been here for so long, but essentially those that make the money is the one that make the rules. That's why it's so easy for rules to be changed.

But beyond the general stance of inevitability, most professional stakeholders are wary of creating robust forums specifically for relocated public housing residents, arguing instead that integrating them into the “normal” mechanisms and processes of the neighborhood will reduce the isolation and exceptionalism that characterized their life in the old public housing developments. As a macro-level stakeholder put it, “We want you to learn how to operate within the constraints of a normal environment, not a separate environment.” Or, in the words of a development stakeholder at Oakwood Shores:

We don’t want to think of it as public housing, kind of, speaking for you. You have rights as a resident here, not because you’re a public housing person . . . but because you are a person.

For relocated public housing residents, however, this shift is largely seen as disempowering, ceding authority to more powerful others—homeowners, professionals who manage the development, CHA officials, and various neighborhood associations. According to a relocated public housing resident at Park Boulevard:

Well, it was different at Stateway because Stateway always had a meeting. You was always able to get up to the mike and, you know, give them your opinion. . . . Since I’ve been here . . . they not having any meetings and if they is, it must be private. (*Laughs*)

In lieu of participatory mechanisms to organize and represent relocated public housing residents directly, institutional leaders such as the Alderman, staff of service organizations, housing authority executives, public housing advocates, and development stakeholders sometimes take on a representative function, speaking on behalf of the relocated public housing resident population, particularly in the Working Groups and, for development stakeholders, in forums held by owners associations and broader neighborhood forums. As a development stakeholder at Oakwood Shores suggests:

[We see ourselves] as the connector to [the neighborhood-based organization] as well as kind of a voice sometimes to be able to say, “Well, here’s what our residents are saying” when residents are not there to speak for themselves.

Rather than investing in separate mechanisms for relocated public housing residents, most professional stakeholders share a goal of social integration of residents across income and housing backgrounds in the social and deliberative mechanisms the neighborhood provides. To the extent that intentional efforts at fostering robust participation is seen as important, most of them, along with a minority of residents (particularly at Oakwood Shores and Park Boulevard), suggest the need for an inclusive neighborhood association that incorporates *all* residents. A community stakeholder at Park Boulevard put it this way:

Instead of the condo association and the homeowners association, I would like them to just form a resident association where homeowners, condos, and residents sit on that same board. To make it one community.

As a Westhaven Park development stakeholder put it, shaping such forums will not come about on its own, but will need to be facilitated:

So I almost think you have to abolish [the existing homeowners associations] and create one that is made up of everybody, so that everybody's interests is represented and can be heard, and all concerns are brought to the table. . . . If everyone was in the room and then people could see that a lot of your concerns are my concerns. I want good schools. I want parks and playgrounds. I want grocery stores. I want cleaners. Like we all pretty much want the same thing, and there's some things that we all don't want. Like we don't want crime. We don't want loitering.¹¹

In two sites, efforts to create such an organization have shown mixed results. The Bronzeville-Oakland Neighborhood Association (BONA) at Oakwood Shores and the Neighbors' Development Network (NDN) at Westhaven Park both attempted to recruit a diverse group of residents to participate but, as leaders of these organizations noted in interviews and we noted in our meeting observations over the two- to three-year period that both organizations have been functioning, for the most part residents who have engaged are either relocated public housing residents (BONA) or owners (NDN), but not both. As a member of BONA described the challenge:

When we started doing our meetings, we had some slips where we'd slip [into talking about] tenants issues. . . . Then we recognized that some people might take people as, "Ugh, that's just rentals' issues.

That's not homeowners' issues." So we've changed. . . . But rather than just trying to stay away from the wordings or the themes that say "tenants v. homeowners," we're just trying to say "residents."

There are a few forums, however, which draw more broadly from relocated public housing residents, renters, higher-income residents in the development, and the neighborhood more broadly, especially around issues of crime and safety. The primary forum where these issues are debated and where broader participation is fostered is at CAPS meetings. Although major crime issues (gang violence, narcotic sales, burglaries) in the neighborhoods are of concern, except in response to a specific incident (such as a shooting) that has just occurred, most of the discussion at CAPS meetings centers on community standards of conduct around loitering, noise, appropriate youth behavior, curfew, and unruly park activities. Residents who participate often represent a cross section of the community and discuss implementing a range of responses (phone trees, block clubs, security patrols) to such concerns. But the most significant force behind such discussions often comes from homeowners. An Oakwood Shores development stakeholder notes owners' initiative on these issues:

A lot of the homeowners have a vested interest. . . . So they understand the importance of getting involved. They're kind of rising to the occasion with regards to that to a certain extent.

As we have observed repeatedly at CAPS meetings in all three sites, the tenor of discussion around such issues is often contentious, and responsibility for the transgressions discussed are often laid—sometimes by implication, sometimes explicitly—at the feet of relocated public housing residents. As a Westhaven Park community stakeholder puts it:

The target becomes people in public housing; it's just easier to lump them in as a group. . . . The police have told them a dozen times: this is a social situation, you have to figure out ways culturally, socially, to deal with it, you can't police this away, and so those tensions are heightened, because [the relocated public housing residents] know who called the police, know who's giving them grief. . . . It's a clash unlike anything I've seen, and to get anywhere remotely close to that, you'd have to go back to when Blacks were trying integrate communities back in the 60s, to get that kind of venom and rabid anger that comes out when people are talking about the neighborhood.

Indeed, conflict over appropriate strategies for addressing safety, security, and dissatisfaction with housing management and police response led owners at Westhaven Park to organize for stronger responses. Owners' pressure on the police commander and on the CEO of the CHA, largely through letter-writing campaigns and public meetings, resulted in increased patrols, generated influential pressure to force the replacement of a property management company, and helped solicit a commitment by the CHA to redevelop the "Superblock"—a set of town house-style, public housing residences that sit in the middle of the mixed-income development—as mixed-income housing. Renters' response to these changes varies, but many agree that the owners' connections have influenced direct changes in the neighborhood. As one affordable renter from Westhaven Park commented:

You don't see drug trafficking out here. . . . I don't see why they would put [a police surveillance light] out there, but it was probably because the people in the condos that were buying—they wanted it to be under surveillance.

Thus, even in contexts of broader participation, the interests and orientations of property owners and institutional players tend to outweigh those of relocated public housing residents and other (especially low-income) renters. Indeed, the dynamics of CAPS meetings challenge the extent to which "mainstreaming" strategies, by themselves, provide meaningful opportunities for relocated public housing residents to have influence on community deliberations about collective concerns. As a Westhaven Park community stakeholder describes the dynamic:

If you've been sold that this is the greatest thing since sliced bread, once again, the first thing that interferes with that image, the natural reaction is for people to go okay, what have I gotten into, but since I'm here, this is what I'm going to do, I'm not dealing with these people. . . . If they cross my path I'm calling the police. . . . So the condo meetings, the block meetings . . . they're all designed to attack the thing that you dislike the most.

The Always Underlying and Sometimes Explicit Significance of Race

While the new developments are referred to as "mixed-income" and discussions of differential access to decision making are often framed in terms of

class, socioeconomic status, or public housing status, race remains a fundamental factor in how stakeholders and residents understand and describe the ways in which participation and exclusion are manifest. We briefly highlight three ways in which race surfaced in our interviews and observations.

First, given the historical and enduring context of racial segregation and disenfranchisement in Chicago, current perceptions of tension and inequity are often framed by respondents as simply reproducing the reality of broader social dynamics in this city. As one development team member stated:

We knew what the tensions were going to be, we warned them what the tensions were going to be, I mean, it's not rocket science, you know, when you take a community that's been traditionally poor, 98, 99, 100% African-American, and then within a year you dump in another 200, 300 people of different races, cultures, classes, and understanding, that's tension, it comes with the territory.

Or as another described it: "What I see happening really clearly is that, ok, so now we've got a condo association and we've got public housing residents that are not working and most of them are what race? They're African-American." He explained that as the dynamics unfold with some condo owners complaining about their African-American neighbors, it can result in a feeling among African-American renters that:

They are all out to get us. They don't like us because we're African-American or public housing . . . residents. So I think that is a bad setup for a city that's already segregated already. That is just a terrible setup. We're already, the city of Chicago is known to be very segregated, a very segregated city. And that is just going to add fuel to the fire.

This sense of racial inequity and marginalization is further heightened by the widespread sense among relocated public housing residents that these mixed-income developments are part of a "takeover" of the neighborhoods by Whites.

Second, a complicated dynamic emerges for African-American homeowners and market-rate renters who find themselves at once aligned with higher-income residents but also with a unique ability, if they so choose, to engage with the public housing population on the basis of race. We observed numerous instances of Black owners and market-rate renters taking the lead on community activities aimed to include relocated public housing residents. On the other hand, we also observed the very same residents articulating

complaints about the lack of adherence to acceptable norms. After describing an incident in a meeting where a homeowner was particularly vocal in distinguishing between rights that should pertain to owners alone, a development stakeholder added:

Incidentally, she was a Black professional, not that race is the total story, because it's not, it's race, class, economics, and she did something that I know somebody White sitting in that room would be thinking, but never say, and that's one of the problems with, as I've watched some of these groups grow over time, they put Black folks in leadership positions, as president or whatever, so that they become the official attack dogs for the organization, and they'll do and say things that the White members are feeling but the White members would never publicly do.

This echoes Mary Pattillo's (2007) notion of Black gentrifiers in the role of "upwardly aligned middlemen" and "middlewomen"; although respondents in our study shared their own experiences with racial affronts from their neighbors, they most often were as critical of the behaviors of low-income African-American families.

Third, the tensions about rules and sanctions in the new developments are most often driven, not by a disagreement about the need for standards of community conduct, but by resentment over the ways in which acceptable norms are determined without the input of relocated public housing residents and without respecting those habits and conventions—like socializing in front of buildings rather than in back—that are considered to be associated with lower-income African-Americans (cf. Chaskin and Joseph 2012).

Conclusion

Our findings reflect enduring dilemmas about the challenge of democratic participation and representation for low-income citizens in the context of efforts to integrate public housing residents into newly created, heterogeneous, mixed-income developments. We find that a fundamental tension exists between two orientations to framing opportunities for participation. On one hand are orientations, espoused particularly by housing authority staff and private developers, that privilege "mainstreaming" public housing resident participation into the associations and interactions of the market and civil society in lieu of more specialized spaces that support deliberation

about and advocacy for their particular needs. On the other hand are orientations, promoted more often by relocated public housing residents and their advocates as well as by other low-income renters, that suggest the need for robust mechanisms that maximize public housing resident and other low-income renter representation and provide avenues for advocating for their specific needs in these new contexts. In practice, the “voice” of public housing (and other low-income) residents within the broader forums invoked by the first orientation is quite weak. In the context of the varied and more influential mechanisms that more effectively represent the concerns of higher-income residents and the interests of major institutional players (developers, the city, the housing authority), the opportunities for deliberation and influence for relocated public housing residents are limited. Thus, in spite of arguments that separate representational mechanisms marginalize public housing residents by highlighting their exceptionalism, efforts to “mainstream” their participation have so far tended to further marginalize them by undermining their ability to advocate effectively for their priorities and concerns.

Returning to the theoretical debates over the potential for establishing effective mechanisms to promote deliberative democracy at a neighborhood-level that we used to frame our empirical investigation, the emerging mixed-income communities that we studied in Chicago evidence no progress toward facilitating strong and inclusive participation by low-income individuals. Despite the possibilities within these contrived and highly managed settings for the CHA and their development partners to be creative and proactive in the design of participatory mechanisms, there exist stark differences of opinion among stakeholders and residents regarding the extent that local knowledge, local rights, and local power should be prioritized and in their thinking about the structures that might facilitate these factors. Concerns in the academic literature that participatory mechanisms are often more symbolic than actual, are vulnerable to cooptation, and are fraught with challenges to representativeness and legitimacy have all been borne out in these three new mixed-income developments in Chicago, and orientations toward collaborative governance have largely reproduced these shortcomings, rather than serving as “civic enabler,” per Sirianni (2009), or establishing well-functioning mechanisms that promote “accountable autonomy,” per Fung (2006).

These outcomes may be the product of design (governance mechanisms and participatory orientations intentionally serving to control rather than promote meaningful participation), or omission (professionals responsible for the shaping of these developments not focusing on these issues while under pressure to create solutions “on the fly,” responding to shifting circumstances

and the inputs of shifting coalitions of actors), or the failures of implementation (instantiated in poorly designed and facilitated participatory mechanisms and insufficient recognition of the inequalities regarding access and influence they reproduce). Regardless of the reason, establishing more inclusive and equitable decision-making processes at the new developments seems critical, both to make good on the stated commitment to create revitalized communities where relocated public housing residents have opportunities for inclusion and to create marketable communities where tensions among residents of different incomes and tenures are minimized and constructively managed when they do emerge.

There are implications for both policy and practice in this regard. At a general level, it seems worth revisiting federal and local policy and administrative procedures to strengthen public housing residents' voice and representation. Unlike the explicit policies the federal government put into place to ensure that local housing authorities create elected local advisory councils and the HOPE VI policies guiding resident input during the redevelopment planning phase, HUD has remained silent about expectations for governance and decision making in the postoccupancy phase of the new mixed-income developments. And rather than use this opportunity to experiment with new site-based forms of resident inclusion and voice, with the exception of the Working Groups (the limitations of which are elaborated above) the CHA has decided to eliminate representative mechanisms completely. Although the Ombudsman's office may provide an outlet for *individual* relocated public housing residents to express grievances, it does not provide the potential for collective organizing, planning, mobilization, and claims making on behalf of relocated public housing residents. Just as resources were previously made available by the CHA to support the functioning of the LACs, there should be some attention to the logistical costs of convening, capacity building, and sustaining broad relocated public housing participation at the sites. In addition, there are obvious limitations to relying on a centralized, CHA-staffed function to promote resident participation that might, after all, challenge CHA priorities and authority. Building an effective and constructive collective governance capacity among relocated public housing residents requires support beyond the Ombudsman and independent of the CHA.

Although controversial, the CHA's efforts to modify the Working Group structure (see endnote 10) provides another opening for broader deliberation about the composition, authority, and longer-term role of Working Groups in the mixed-income developments. Working Groups were originally planned as transitional entities to oversee the build-out of the developments, but they could, potentially at least, provide a mechanism for planning and deliberation

that includes more robust representation of relocated public housing residents and other low-income renters. Such representation should be accompanied by effective democratic processes for selecting participants, training to enable effective participation, and support for activities that promote information exchange and the potential to organize in response to collectively recognized challenges.

As for other on-the-ground associational activities, support could be given to existing development and neighborhood groups to recruit and engage relocated public housing residents more proactively and effectively. This could include training and resources to provide relocated public housing residents with information, capacity building, and leadership development in order to advocate effectively for themselves. Although concerns about adversely generating divisions among residents by strengthening organization and mobilization among relocated public housing residents are real, our findings suggest that the resentment and tensions that are being generated by the current exclusion and marginalization of relocated public housing residents are a greater threat to the viability of these mixed-income developments. By adhering to Iris Marion Young's (1990) call to explicitly take into account social difference by guaranteeing representation of potentially marginalized social groups, the decision-making processes on the ground in these redeveloping neighborhoods may ultimately enhance long-term sustainability.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This research was supported with funding from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and additional funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Notes

1. This language is most explicit in the 2007 Senate reauthorization of HOPE VI, SB 829.
2. Chicago's Plan for Transformation (2000, 3), e.g., references the aspiration that "residents of public housing will be treated as full citizens of the City of Chicago," but citizenship here is more about mainstreaming public housing residents to provide them with access to services in the community rather than providing a separate set of services specifically for public housing residents that, the plan argues, "only serves to further isolate public housing and its residents." The participatory goals of such efforts are more explicit in the United Kingdom, where

- “community engagement” has been a central component of community initiatives begun under New Labor, including housing regeneration schemes (Lawson and Kearns 2010; Taylor 2007).
3. For recent examples of research that does focus on the question of participation in these contexts in the United States, see Smith (2006b), Wright (2006), Fraser and Kick (2007), and Alexander (2009).
 4. We use the term “relocated public housing residents” to refer specifically to those residents who moved from traditional public housing into mixed-income developments, whether they have returned to the development built on the site of the complex in which they lived prior to demolition or have moved to a mixed-income development from a different complex.
 5. Similarly, much of the theoretical rethinking of participatory democracy began to emerge in the wake of urban social movements, protests, and broad calls for participation that emerged in this era. Carole Pateman, e.g., in framing her (1970) critique of democratic theory “orthodoxy” and effort to reexamine the relevance of participation in contemporary democratic theory, points out the irony of the popularity of calls for participation, on one hand, and political theorists’ acceptance of notions of democracy characterized by minimal participation. In France, Henri Lefebvre’s ([1968] 1996) notions of the right to the city as a “hew and cry”—and the framework of participation and appropriation that was to realize this right for the disenfranchised excluded from the sites of elite consumption the city provides—came on the heels of the mass protests of the late 1960s.
 6. Although elected Local Advisory Councils were established earlier in Chicago, the first statutory right to participation in decisions regarding public housing development or demolition came in 1984, but was only directly established for cases of actual demolition (as opposed to “de facto demolition caused by neglect”) in litigation brought against the CHA by the Cabrini-Green Local Advisory Council in 1997 (Poindexter 2000, 663-65; Hunt 2009).
 7. Young defines social groups as “collective[s] of people who have affinity with one another because of a set of practices or way of life,” being careful in this regard to distinguish between social groups and interest or ideological groups, whose basis of identity rests on shared political beliefs. The latter are not, in her argument, to be recognized as social groups for specific representation: “Shared political or moral beliefs, even when they are deeply and passionately held, do not constitute a social group” (1990, 186).
 8. Although LACs have in some cases influenced CHA leadership and successfully mobilized residents and advocacy campaigns to force CHA concessions, the relationship between LAC leaders and CHA officials has been complicated, and co-optation and manipulation through financial incentives and political favors have influenced the dynamics of resident leadership and representation in decision-making processes (Hunt 2009; Venkatesh 2000; Wright 2006).

9. SCP is a subsidiary of the Boulevard Group, a for-profit company based out of Atlanta, which partners on other HOPE VI projects across the country.
10. The CHA first attempted to change the membership composition in October 2010, though after objections by the Central Advisory Council (CAC)—the umbrella group composed of leadership from all LACs—the draft changes were dropped and CHA agreed to ongoing discussions about the representatives (CHA 2010a, 105). The major change proposed by CHA would have removed one of the two LAC members to be replaced by a public housing resident from the mixed-income development who would apply for the two-year appointed position. The proposal would have also ensured that an owner or (non-public housing) renter from the mixed-income development would represent the position of the surrounding community (CHA 2010b, 42). In April 2011, the CHA announced that this change would now be implemented, to the surprise and concern of some of the current Working Group members whose input had not been sought in this decision. None of this is settled as of the time of writing, and there are ongoing discussions about increasing resident representation on the Working Groups.
11. Although there is broad agreement about the desire for safety, there are often disagreements in mixed-income and gentrifying neighborhoods about what “counts” as inappropriate behavior such as the line between “hanging out” and “loitering.” See, e.g., Pattillo 2007; Freeman 2006.

References

- Alexander, L. T. 2009. Stakeholder participation in new governance: Lessons from Chicago's public housing reform experiment. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* 16 (1): 117-85.
- Arnstein, S. R. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35 (4): 216-24.
- Arthurson, K. 2002. Creating inclusive communities through balancing social mix: A critical relationship or tenuous link? *Urban Policy and Research* 20 (2): 245-61.
- Atkinson, R., and K. Kintrea. 2000. Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts. *Policy and Politics* 28 (1): 93-108.
- August, M. 2008. Social mix and Canadian public housing redevelopment: Experiences in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 17 (1): 82-100.
- Barber, B. R. 1984. *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Berry, J. M., K. E. Portney, and K. Thomson. 1993. *The rebirth of urban democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Briggs, X. 1998. Doing democracy up close: Culture, power, and communication in community planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18 (1): 1-13.

- Briggs, X. 2008. *Democracy as problem solving: Civic capacity in communities across the globe*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chaskin, R. J. 2003. Fostering neighborhood democracy: Legitimacy and accountability within loosely coupled systems. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32 (2): 161-89.
- Chaskin, R. J. 2005. Democracy and bureaucracy in a community planning process. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (4): 408-19.
- Chaskin, R. J., and S. Garg. 1997. The issue of governance in neighborhood-based initiatives. *Urban Affairs Review* 32 (5): 631-66.
- Chaskin, R. J., and M. L. Joseph. 2010. Building "community" in mixed-income developments: Assumptions, approaches, and early experiences. *Urban Affairs Review* 45 (3): 299-335.
- Chaskin, R. J., and M. L. Joseph. 2011. Social interaction in mixed-income developments: Relational expectations and emerging reality. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 33 (2): 209-37.
- Chaskin, R. J., and M. L. Joseph. 2012. "Positive" gentrification, social control, and the "right to the city" in mixed-income communities: Uses and expectations of space and place. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01158.x
- Chicago Housing Authority. 2000. *Chicago Housing Authority: Plan for transformation*. Chicago: Chicago Housing Authority.
- Chicago Housing Authority. 2008. *Amended and restated moving to work agreement*, Attachment D, No. 20. Chicago: Chicago Housing Authority.
- Chicago Housing Authority. 2010a. *FY2011 moving to work annual plan: Plan for transformation year 12* [Draft]. Chicago: Chicago Housing Authority.
- Chicago Housing Authority. 2010b. *FY2011 moving to work annual plan: Plan for transformation year 12* [Final]. Chicago: Chicago Housing Authority.
- Cisneros, H., and L. Engdahl. 2009. *From despair to hope: HOPE VI and the new promise of public housing in America's cities*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Cohen, J., and J. Rogers. 1995. *Associations and democracy*. London: Verso.
- Corburn, J. 2005. *Street science: Community knowledge and environment health justice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Crenson, M. A. 1983. *Neighborhood politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Fraser, J. C., and E. L. Kick. 2007. The role of public, private, non-profit and community sectors in shaping mixed-income housing outcomes in the U.S. *Urban Studies* 44 (12): 2357-77.
- Freeman, L. 2006. *There goes the 'hood: Views of gentrification from the ground up*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple Univ. Press.
- Fung, A. 2006. *Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

- Galster, G. 2007. Neighbourhood social mix as a goal of social policy: A theoretical analysis. *European Journal of Housing Policy* 7 (1): 19-43.
- Gans, H. J. 1962. *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian Americans*. Glencoe, NY: Free Press.
- Goetz, E. G. 2000. The politics of poverty deconcentration and housing demolition. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 22 (2): 157-73.
- Graves, E. M. 2010. The structuring of urban life in a mixed-income housing "community." *City & Community* 9 (1): 109-31.
- Haar, C. M. 1975. *Between the idea and the reality: A study in the origin, fate and legacy of the model cities program*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007, S. 829, 110th Congress.
- Hunt, D. B. 2009. *Blueprint for disaster: The unraveling of Chicago public housing*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Joseph, M. L. 2008. Early resident experiences at a new mixed-income development in Chicago. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30 (3): 229-57.
- Joseph, M. L. 2010. Creating mixed-income developments in Chicago: Developer and service provider perspectives. *Housing Policy Debate* 20 (1): 88-115.
- Joseph, M. L., and R. J. Chaskin. 2010. Living in a mixed-income development: Resident perceptions of the benefits and disadvantages of two developments in Chicago. *Urban Studies* 47 (11): 2347-66.
- Joseph, M. L., R. J. Chaskin, and H. S. Webber. 2007. The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development. *Urban Affairs Review* 42 (3): 369-409.
- Judge, D. 1995. Pluralism. In *Theories of urban politics*, edited by D. Judge, G. Stoker, and H. Wolman, 13-34. London: Sage.
- Kearns, A., and P. Mason. 2007. Mixed tenure communities and neighbourhood quality. *Housing Studies* 22 (5): 661-91.
- Kleit, R. 2005. HOPE VI new communities: Neighborhood relationships in mixed-income housing. *Environment and Planning A* 37 (8): 1413-41.
- Lawson, L., and A. Kearns. 2010. Community engagement in regeneration: Are we getting the point? *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 25 (1): 19-36.
- Lees, L. 2008. Gentrification and social mixing: Towards an inclusive urban renaissance? *Urban Studies* 45 (12): 2449-70.
- Lefebvre, H. (1968) 1996. The right to the city. In *Writings on cities*, translated by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lowndes, V. 2009. New institutionalist perspectives on urban politics. In *Theories of urban politics*, 2nd ed., edited by J. S. Davies and D. L. Imbroscio, 91-105. London: Sage.
- Mansbridge, J. J. 1980. *Beyond adversary democracy*. New York: Basic Books.

- Marris, P., and M. Rein. (1967) 1992. *Dilemmas of social reform: Poverty and community action in the United States*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Melo, M. A., and G. Baiocchi. 2006. Deliberative democracy and local governance: Towards a new agenda. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (3): 587-600.
- Mollenkopf, J. H. 1983. *The contested city*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Mossberger, K., and G. Stoker. 2001. The evolution of urban regime theory: The challenge of conceptualization. *Urban Affairs Review* 36 (6): 810-35.
- Mustard, S., and R. Andersson. 2005. Housing mix, social mix and social opportunities. *Urban Affairs Review* 40:761-90.
- O'Connor, A. 1999. Swimming against the tide: A brief history of federal policy in poor communities. In *Urban problems and community development*, edited by R. F. Ferguson and W. T. Dickens, 77-138. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Pateman, C. 1970. *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pattillo, M. 2007. *Black on the block: The politics of race and class in the city*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Pierre, J. 1999. Models of urban governance: The institutional dimension of urban politics. *Urban Affairs Review* 34 (3): 372-96.
- Poindexter, G. C. 2000. Who gets the final no? Tenant participation in public housing redevelopment. *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy* 9 (3): 659-83.
- Popkin, S. J., B. Katz, M. Cunningham, K. D. Brown, J. Gustafson, and M. Turner. 2004. *A decade of Hope VI: Research findings and policy challenges*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute and Brookings Institution.
- Purdue, D. 2001. Neighbourhood governance: Leadership, trust and social capital. *Urban Studies* 38 (12): 2211-24.
- Rubin, L. B. 1969. Maximum feasible participation: The origins, implications, and present status. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 385 (1): 14-29.
- Sirianni, C. 2009. *Investing in democracy: Engaging citizens in collaborative governance*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Smith, J. L. 2006a. Public housing transformation: Evolving national policy. In *Where are poor people to live? Transforming public housing communities*, edited by L. Bennett, J. L. Smith, and P. A. Wright, 19-40. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Smith, J. L. 2006b. The Chicago Housing Authority's plan for transformation. In *Where are poor people to live? Transforming public housing communities*, edited by L. Bennett, J. L. Smith, and P. A. Wright, 93-124. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Stone, C. N. 1989. *Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

- Stone, C. N. 2009. Who is governed? Local citizens and the political order of cities. In *Theories of urban politics*, 2nd ed., edited by J. S. Davies and D. L. Imbroscio, 257-73. London: Sage.
- Tach, L. 2009. More than bricks and mortar: Neighborhood frames, social processes, and the mixed-income redevelopment of a public housing project. *City & Community* 8 (3): 269-99.
- Taylor, M. 2007. Community participation in the real world: Opportunities and pitfalls in new governance spaces. *Urban Studies* 44 (2): 297-317.
- Venkatesh, S. A. 2000. *American project: The rise and fall of a modern ghetto*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Verba, S., K. L. Schlozman, and H. E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- von Hoffman, A. 2003. *House by house, block by block: The rebirth of America's urban neighborhoods*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Wilens, W. P. 2006. The Horner Model: Successfully redeveloping public housing. *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy* 1 (1): 62-95.
- Wright, P. A. 2006. Community resistance to CHA transformation: The history, evolution, struggles, and accomplishments of the coalition to protect public housing. In *Where are poor people to live? Transforming public housing communities*, edited by L. Bennett, J. L. Smith, and P. A. Wright, 125-67. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yates, D. 1973. *Neighborhood democracy: The politics and impacts of decentralization*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Young, I. M. 1990. *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Bios

Robert Chaskin is an Associate Professor and Deputy Dean for Strategic Initiatives at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration, and is an affiliated scholar at Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. Among other topics, his publications have explored the conceptual foundations and principal strategies of contemporary community intervention in the context of urban poverty; issues of participation, planning and neighborhood governance; comprehensive community initiatives and other efforts to promote "community capacity" in urban neighborhoods. Recent publications include *Youth Gangs and Community Intervention* (editor, Columbia University Press 2010) and "Social Interaction in Mixed-Income Developments: Relational Expectations and Emerging Reality" (2011) with Mark Joseph in the *Journal of Urban Affairs*.

Amy Khare is a second year Ph.D. student at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration. Her scholarly interests are urban poverty, housing policy, and community organizing and development. Prior to pursuing her doctorate, she served as project director for a study of Chicago's mixed-income public housing communities. Her professional experience is in the area of non-profit management of community and housing development organizations.

Mark Joseph is an Associate Professor at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University and a Faculty Associate at the Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development. His research interests include urban poverty, community development, mixed-income development, and comprehensive community initiatives. Recent publications include "Life in a Mixed-Income Development: Resident Perceptions at Two Developments in Chicago" (2010) with Robert Chaskin in *Urban Studies* and "Creating Mixed-Income Developments in Chicago: Developer and Service Provider Perspectives (2010) in *Housing Policy Debate*.