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PURPOSE

This report assesses progress in achieving the goals and performance objectives of the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan for the three-square-mile area bounded by Broadway Road and Southern Avenue, Seventh Avenue to 24th Street. It describes accomplishments over the 17-year period since the area’s designation and adoption of the Redevelopment Plan and how the $25.9 million allocated to the project has been spent. The report also identifies the remaining needs, priorities for addressing those needs and recommended strategies.

Target Area B was one of three areas which the city of Phoenix identified in 1978 for a comprehensive revitalization approach called for by the federal Community Development Block Grant program. The intent of the program was for cities to target several areas in which they would address social, economic, and physical development needs simultaneously and over a number of years. Citizen identified needs and participation were to drive the program using public, private and non-profit resources with a goal toward leveraging of public dollars to the maximum extent feasible.

Needs Identified in 1978 and 1979

A Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) worked with city staff and area residents and business owners to identify goals as well as general and specific performance objectives designed to:

- Eliminate blight and physical development inhibitors, including dilapidated structures; Rehabilitate housing and build new housing affordable for area residents, including any displaced as a result of redevelopment;
- Install infrastructure—sidewalks and paved streets, water and sewer lines, storm sewers, tiling of irrigation ditches, and sidewalks;
- Develop or expand public facilities and shopping opportunities;
- Improve area maintenance;
- Rezone land to correspond with the desired land use plan;
- Provide small businesses with counseling and loans;
- Provide jobs and job training to area residents; and
- Expand the availability of social services.

The Steering Committee identified $38.6 million dollars of housing rehabilitation, public infrastructure and facility needs. The list of needs did not address the costs to eliminate other blighting influences or address economic and social needs.

Key Demographic Facts - Then and Now

Target Area B (TAB) grew from 12,946 persons in 1980 to 13,665 persons in 1995. This growth mostly occurred in the western third of the area; the eastern third lost residents. The number of family nonmarried households increased from 24% in 1980 to 33% in 1990 compared to 16% in 1990 for the City. The percentage of minority populations increased from 77% in 1980 to 90% in 1995 with the Hispanic population increasing from 38% to 62% of the total population. The Black population has always been most heavily concentrated in the eastern third of the area and the Hispanic population in the western portion. The percentage of adults 25 and over with less than a high school diploma was 58% in 1990 which was more than twice the citywide average of 22%. Student achievement in the Roosevelt Elementary District schools which serve the area is uniformly below the district’s standards partially due to the high percentage of “at risk” students enrolled in the schools. The report lists the many special programs and partnerships available at the schools.

The median household income in 1980 was $11,291 or 65% of the city’s median household income. By 1990, the TAB median household income had increased to $15,567 but was only 53% of the city’s median household income. The percentage of households living below the poverty level rose from 29% in 1980 to 37% in 1990 compared to the 12% the citywide average in 1990.

Land Use & Zoning Characteristics - Then and Now

Land use in TAB is 47% single-family housing, 30% vacant or farmed, 9% public or quasi-public, 5% commercial, 4% multi-family housing, and 3% parks and open space. Since 1978, all categories have increased slightly in percentage except for multi-family, commercial and vacant. Commercial uses declined by 54 acres; multi-family uses increased by 12 acres but remained constant in percentage.
Despite this land use pattern, 44% of the land is zoned for multi-family uses. The area's zoning pattern is based on what the land was zoned in Maricopa County at the time of annexation in 1960. Vacant land remains undeveloped due to blighting factors such as illegal dumping and nonconforming uses including open and unscreened storage, small parcels scattered throughout the area, and lack of market demand. Vacant multifamily zoned land exists primarily in the center of the area; vacant single-family zoned land is located primarily in the southeast quadrant of the area. Vacant commercial land is scattered along the major streets. City-owned vacant land, shown on the map (Figure 26) is located along Central Avenue near Broadway Road, along both sides of Broadway Road from Seventh Avenue to 24th Streets, and on or close to the west side of 16th Street. It is mostly zoned for commercial purposes.

In 1978 area residents identified abandoned vehicles and structures, illegal uses, automobile storage and junk yards, and secondhand stores and appliance repair stores with display merchandise on the sidewalks as blighting concerns. The TAB program has funded the purchase and demolition of structures, boardups, and lot cleanups. There have been 634 property maintenance and zoning enforcement/violation cases since 1990 involving blighted conditions of structures and yards. Of those, 112 were active in March 1997.

Since 1985, six small (24-116 units) multi-family complexes, 24 single-family homes and 72 townhouses have been constructed. The most recent single-family subdivision of 24 homes started in 1992. A small shopping center, a few office buildings, and slightly over 300,000 square feet of industrial space have also been built. The city has provided assistance to 19 development projects as shown on Figure 26.

### Housing Conditions - Then and Now

The total number of housing units in TAB increased from 4,039 in 1980 to 4,430 in 1995. Most of the increase has been in multi-family units. There have been 38 housing units demolished. Half of the TAB housing was built prior to 1963 versus 1973 for the city as a whole. A housing condition survey in 1978 determined that 88% of the units were in good condition or needed minor repair; 12% needed major repair or were not feasible to repair. The 1978 survey also identified 136 abandoned, boarded-up or burned-out housing structures. A 1994 survey using the same criteria found 91% in good condition or only needing minor repair and 9% needing major repair or not feasible to repair. The improvement in structural housing conditions, despite the relative increase of poverty of area residents, is a reflection of the city's investment in housing programs in the area.

Owner occupied housing units in TAB decreased from 59% in 1980 to 51% in 1990; the city's ownership rate experienced a similar decrease during this period. Homes in TAB increased in median value from $27,300 to $48,600 in 1990 but remained lower than the city's median value of $94,335 in 1990. Average rents of $253 in 1990 in TAB were also lower than the city's average rent of $394. Overcrowding continues to occur in about 20% of the housing units.

### Crime Rates and Programs - Then and Now

In 1978, the CAC identified the need to provide more police officers and resources to reduce crime rates, particularly arson and juvenile gang activities. At that time the crime rate against persons in TAB was 50% higher than the city's crime rate; crimes against property were 40% higher than the city's rate. In 1979, the South Mountain Police Precinct was constructed in TAB adding to the resources available. The Southern Command Station built in 1990 on South Central Avenue just north of TAB serves the greater Phoenix area and included specialty units such as the Neighborhood Response Unit.

In 1996, there were 6.8 gang related crimes per 1,000 people in TAB compared to 1.6 for the city. Robbery, aggravated assault, rape, homicide, burglary, auto theft, domestic violence, gang related crime, drug related crime and calls for service also are significantly higher in TAB than the city-wide rates per thousand persons. Arson rates were not available. The Gang and Dropout Prevention programs are being implemented in TAB to avert gang activity and increase citizen awareness. The Anti-Gang Initiative Program was also introduced in TAB in 1996. Other programs used in the area have included Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), Gang Task Force, New Turf Project, Drug Free Zones, Neighborhood Fightback, and Neighborhood Block Watch. Two Fightback programs and three neighborhood block watch programs have been established in TAB.
The TAB crime rate increased 14% over the last three years compared to an increase of 4% for the city-wide crime rate for the same period. The highest crime grid in TAB is the area from Rooser Road to Southern Avenue, Central Avenue to Seventh Street, partially because of the larger amount of commercial activity in this grid than in others in TAB.

**Infrastructure Needs - Then and Now**

Citizens and staff identified the following needs: 16 miles of streets pavement or improvement; 43 miles of sidewalk installation; 31 streetlights; 7.5 miles of water line installation or replacement; 6 miles of storm sewer installation; 2.5 miles of sanitary sewer installation; and 9 miles of irrigation ditch tiling.

The following percentages of infrastructure needs remain: street paving 2% or .3 miles; water lines 27% or 2 miles; storm sewers 10% or .6 miles; sanitary sewers 3% or .8 miles; irrigation tiling 13% or 1 mile; and sidewalks 38% or 16.4 miles. Some of these needs will be met as vacant land develops; none is seen as a critical problem.

**Public Facility and Service Needs - Then and Now**

The Redevelopment Area Plan proposed fully developing parks and expanding recreational opportunities, expanding library services, developing more social services and providing 24 hour access to medical services. More specific objectives included: expanding Hayden Park; improving Momo Mini Park, Hermoso Park, and Nueve Park; developing a Job Clearing Center; remodeling and expanding the Human Resource Center No.1; purchasing the South Phoenix Youth Center, and developing a hospital in South Mountain Village. Fire service response times were not identified as a problem and today are better than city standards even though the number of incidents for fire and emergency medical service in the area are more than twice the number of city total incidents per 1,000 persons. There are more bus routes serving TAB than there were in 1978.

Most of the public service and facility goals and objectives were met. Parks were expanded or improved and the Youth Center was purchased and began operating in 1980. A new Human Resources Center will be under construction in late 1997. Additional social services are provided at the South Mountain Community Center for all, particularly the elderly and disabled. Two setbacks are that a Job Clearing Center is no longer operated, and Jesse Owens Memorial Medical Center no longer provides overnight medical care. However, medical services in the area have increased. While library services, resources, and hours have generally increased, there are still unmet needs for Friday service, additional materials in Spanish, and literacy tutoring.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**Economic development and job training:** $242,079

- Job Clearing Center provided 439 job referrals to area residents through June 1981.
- Arizona Small Business Development Center under contract to the city provided management assistance to 82 firms and processed 28 loan packages for area businesses.
- A privately developed shopping center was built at the southeast corner of Central and Roseser, but no shopping center exists on the eastern perimeter of TAB.

**Housing:** $9,922,649

- 883 homes rehabilitated through various programs
- 630 homes assisted with painting and landscaping

**Blight Elimination:** $5,591,298

- Property acquisitions, demolitions, boardups, and lots cleaned up

**Infrastructure:** $7,079,297

- 16.3 miles of local, collector, and major streets
- 26.8 miles of sidewalks
- 4.7 miles of water lines
- 1.7 miles of sewer lines
- 4.0 miles of irrigation ditches tiled
Public Facilities: $1,980,506
- Parks, Human Services, Youth and Community Centers and graffiti removal

Non-Profit Organization Support: $1,091,323

PRESENT NEEDS

TAB Committee Recommendations

Economic development and job training
- Provide greater support to small businesses in obtaining funding and provide a contact list for city programs.
- Organize a business alliance to encourage economic development along South Central Avenue.
- Develop the Rio Salado river walk.
- Provide job linkages for residents.

Land use and zoning
- Increase zoning enforcement.
- Rezone incompatible land uses.
- Develop commercial design guidelines.
- Develop city-owned properties.
- Expand the Target Area to include the north side of Broadway Road up to Pueblo Street from 7th Avenue to 24th Street.

Or
- Expand the Target Area to include the northeast corner of 7th Avenue and the northwest corner of 24th Street and gradually include all of the north side of Broadway.

Housing
- Provide better quality housing in TAB.

Infrastructure
- Complete the 1978 recommended improvements.

Crime
- Provide more police officers and resources, and continue the partnership between Police and Zoning Enforcement.
- Conduct more undercover police operations.
- Provide housing incentives for police officers to live in the area.
- Organize more block watches, better coordination, and neighborhood participation in reporting crime.
- Secure vacant structures.
- Provide more programs at elementary schools to deter crime and gang activities at an early age.
- Provide more youth programs.

Public facilities and services
- Construct a swimming pool at Hayden Park.
- Construct a minibus terminal at Broadway Road and Central Avenue on one of the city’s properties similar to the one in Sunnyslope.
Extend the proposed light rail transit on Central Avenue to Southern Avenue.

- Improve bus frequency.
- Extend library hours.

**Resident and Business Owner Concerns as identified in the 1996 sample survey**

- Assemble and sell vacant land for development.
- Remove structurally substandard buildings to promote neighborhood stability.
- Eliminate unsuitable land uses.
- Increase the number of adequate jobs.
- Reduce crime and gang problems.
- Remove or curtail vandalism, graffiti, blighted structures, and lack of residential maintenance.
- Provide more information on marketing strategies, market research, city taxes and business counseling services.
- Attract more businesses to the area.

### Top Five Ranked Recommendations by Committee

1. Improve transit and transportation services.
   - a. Construct a minibus terminal south of Broadway Road on Central Avenue on one of the city’s properties similar to the terminal in Sunnyslope.
   - b. Improve bus frequency.
   - c. Extend any future proposed light rail transit on Central Avenue to Southern Avenue.

2. Provide more programs at elementary schools to deter crime and gang activities at an early age.

3. Organize a business alliance to encourage economic development along South Central Avenue.

4. Develop city-owned properties.

5. Provide more police officers and resources; and continue the partnership between Police, Zoning Enforcement, and Parks Departments.

### Priority Ranking of Staff Recommendations by TAB Committee

1. Expand the redevelopment area to include the north side of Broadway Road from 7th Avenue to 24th Street as far north as the alley or the first street. West of 13th Street the redevelopment area may have to extend further north. An additional option would be to establish a new redevelopment area from the boundary north of Broadway Road up to the river from 7th Avenue to 24th Street. The latter would require significant funding sources and would address Rio Salado concerns. Another alternative would be expand TAB based on neighborhood areas.

2. Create attractive gateways at South Central Avenue and Broadway Road and at 24th Street and Broadway Road.

3. Encourage the participation of private lenders in developing programs that address the specific needs of TAB.

4. Upgrade commercial uses along South Central Avenue and address housing near Hayden Park.

5. Target blight elimination and code enforcement efforts along South Central Avenue from Broadway Road to Roesser Avenue which is the village core, 24th Street, Broadway Road and Southern Avenue which serve as major gateways. Identify specific properties in greatest need and work with Zoning Enforcement and property owners to achieve compliance with city standards. Identify funding sources or market opportunities for screening of outside uses or conversion to other commercial uses.

6. Develop city owned land on the southeast corner of Central Avenue and Broadway Road: market study of potential commercial uses.

7. Assist first-time homebuyers to acquire and/or rehabilitate single-family homes for home ownership.
8. Rezone city-owned properties to the appropriate zones after market studies have been conducted for them. Give first priority to C-3 zoned sites on South Central Avenue.

9. Plan strategy for the comprehensive revitalization of TAB and explore what can be done to stimulate the development or rehabilitation of quality housing.

10. Install landscaping and screening along 24th Street from the river to Southern Avenue to improve the north/south eastern gateway image.

11. Develop city-owned land on the southwest corner and west side of 16th Street, south of Broadway Road: market study of potential employment uses and impact of blight on these sites.

12. Expand the Target Area B Citizens Advisory Committee to include representation from each neighborhood in the area and develop an annual work program, meeting schedule, and set of objectives.

13. Place a zoning overlay over Broadway Road and South Central Avenue to eliminate expansion of outside storage and uses except with a use permit. This may warrant a city-wide text amendment.

14. Encourage new market rate single-family housing south of Roeser Road east of 21st Street over to 24th Street.

15. Address Rio Salado development in a future redevelopment area.

16. Conduct an assessment every five years corresponding to the most recent census year to determine changes in demographics and to make recommendations for programs.

17. Conduct Systematic Code Enforcement in TAB.

18. Screen commercial uses next to Hayden Park.

19. Pursue the elimination of illegal uses at the southwest corner of 12th Street and Broadway Road, the parking on the west side of 24th Street south of Sunland Avenue, and the storage warehouse on South Fifth Street.

20. Focus on improving residential areas around South Mountain High School, the proposed NFL Y.E.T. Academy on Second Street, south of Broadway Road, and the area east of Rose Linda School on 12th Street.

21. Explore the feasibility of rezoning vacant multifamily zoned parcels along Roeser Road to single-family or R-2 zoning.

22. Focus future funding on job linkage and training.

23. Cleanup vacant lot and promote economic development on the northeast corner of Roeser Road and Central Avenue.

24. Help to stabilize neighborhoods in the TAB by encouraging the acquisition and renovation of existing multifamily properties.

25. Rehabilitate homes in the area south of Hayden Park, near the large vacant site at the southeast corner of Wier and Fourth Avenue.

26. Develop public-private partnerships to construct new single-family and multifamily properties.

27. Relocate the auto repair facility at the northeast corner of Southern Avenue and Central Avenue and redevelop the shopping center after Safeway relocates if necessary.

28. Pursue establishment of a South Central Avenue property owners association to improve the image and profitability of businesses as well as expansion and new development opportunities.

29. Focus on the north side of Roeser Road between Ninth Street and 12th Street. There is vacant land at all four corners of 12th Street and Roeser Roads.

30. Construct half street improvements adjacent to Sunland Elementary School on Chambers Street and 5th Avenue.

31. Develop a new name and identity for the area.
The Target Area B Redevelopment Plan provides residents, businesses, neighborhood organizations, and city government with an overall guide and framework for stabilizing, developing, and revitalizing Target Area B (TAB). City Council approved the Redevelopment Plan in January 1980, and a subsequent Action Plan in October 1980. The Redevelopment Plan provides the legal basis to enable public acquisition and disposition of property for the purpose of eliminating blighted conditions.

The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate whether or not the redevelopment goals and objectives of the Plan have been met. The assessment compares past and present conditions to determine the amount of blight eliminated over the years; the number of capital improvement projects that have been completed (i.e., streets, sidewalks, lights, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and housing rehabilitation); and the type of programs and amount of funding resources used to accomplish redevelopment goals and objectives. It also includes recommendations for future expenditures.

Target Area B is located in South Mountain Village. It is bounded by Broadway Road to the north; Southern Avenue to the south; 7th Avenue to the west; and 24th Street to the east (see Boundary Map, Figure 1). The area east of Central Avenue is situated in City Council District 8; while the area west of Central Avenue is situated in Council District 7.

The target area is divided into 14 geographical areas called neighborhood revitalization subareas. These subareas were selected as a way of identifying and characterizing healthy, declining, deteriorated, or strip-developed neighborhoods (see Neighborhood Subarea Map, Figure 2).

There are three (3) census tract areas in TAB: 1158, 1159, and 1160. All three census tracts extend north and south from Broadway Road to Southern Avenue. From west to east, census tract 1158 extends from 7th Avenue to 7th Street; census tract 1159 extends from 7th Street to 16th Street; and tract 1160 extends from 16th Street to 24th Street. Census tract data was used in this report as a standardized means of comparing a one square mile geographical area to another at the same time and over a 20 year period.

According to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) by-laws, the purpose of the committee is to identify, review, recommend, and participate in actions and projects that assist the target area residents, businesses, neighborhood organizations, and city government to improve and revitalize the target area. Specifically, the committee’s role is to study and determine the housing, transportation, open space, community facilities, infrastructure, and redevelopment needs in the target area that benefit low and moderate income persons and special groups.

The Redevelopment Plan states that all development, both residential and commercial resulting from public action including redevelopment activities and land purchase, will be subject to review and recommendation by the CAC for appropriateness as measured against the objectives of the plan.

Membership and participation in the CAC have declined since the committee was established 18 years ago. Membership peaked during the early years of the Redevelopment Plan when all 14 subareas were well represented by neighborhood residents. Since the late 1980's, sustaining membership representation for the subareas has been a challenge. Currently, the committee has 15 members. However, committee members are no longer being selected to represent the subareas.
What role has been played by the TAB neighborhood organizations?

Neighborhood organizations have played a major role in encouraging property maintenance and neighborhood rehabilitation in Target Area B. They have participated in programs such as Neighborhood Block Watches and Fight Backs to discourage criminal activity and safeguard their community by installing additional street lights, conducting neighborhood clean-ups, and providing after-school programs. There are 18 neighborhood organizations in the area registered with the City of Phoenix Neighborhood Notification Office. Although some neighborhood organizations are based outside Target Area B, their geographical boundaries overlap into the target area. The following is a list of groups located in the three square mile area:

1. AMC Block Watch
2. Black United Fund
3. Braewood Neighborhood Association
4. Concerned Citizens Block Watch Association
5. Hayden Park Fight Back
6. Julian Neighborhood Association
7. Monte Vista Association
8. Neighborhood “Spirit” Association
9. Park South (Original Block Watch)
10. People United Fight Back
11. Rio Vista Neighborhood Association
12. South Mountain Chamber of Commerce
13. South Mountain Vistas of Tomorrow Council
14. South Phoenix Action Neighborhood Association
15. South Phoenix Neighborhood Super Coalition
16. Southern Estates Block Watch
17. Sunland Avenue Homeowners Association
18. Women’s Block Club

How was the assessment prepared?

The assessment included a 1996 Land Use Survey, a TAB Resident and Business Survey, continued input from the TAB Citizens Advisory Committee as well as review of other departments’ records and recent census data. The methods used are further described in the Appendix.
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**GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES**

What were the initial goals and performance objectives of the TAB Redevelopment Plan?

In 1979, the following Redevelopment Plan goals were established to guide redevelopment activities and revitalization efforts:

1. **Blight Removal:**
   Ensure the stability of existing viable residential areas and stabilize declining residential neighborhoods by removing structurally substandard buildings and blighting influences which act as a disincentive for private reinvestment.

2. **Physical Development Inhibitors:**
   Eliminate environmental deficiencies, including small and irregular lot subdivisions, incompatible land uses, and inadequate street layout.

3. **Land Assembly and Improved Utilities:**
   Remove impediments to land disposition and development through assembly of land into reasonably sized and shaped parcels served by improved public utilities.

4. **Low/Moderate Income Housing:**
   Encourage and assist in the provision of a sufficient number of low and moderate income housing units in a suitable living environment.

5. **Appropriate Population Densities:**
   Ensure the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods and preservation of the environment.

6. **Relocation Housing:**
   Provide a sufficient number of adequate housing units for those households involuntarily displaced as a result of redevelopment activity so that those households that choose to may continue living in the area.

7. **Improved Utilities:**
   Provide adequate public services and facilities to meet the needs of the Target Area.

8. **Safe, Functional Transportation System:**
   Encourage the location and design of transportation routes, compatible with land uses and the existing streets system, which will promote the free and safe flow of traffic.

9. **Sense of Community and Attractive Neighborhoods:**
   Create a sense of community and neighborhood throughout the Target Area in order to enhance it attractiveness as a place to live, work, and play.

**CITY ACTIONS**

The following city actions were identified in 1978 to guide the TAB program. The city was instructed to take the following proposed redevelopment actions to achieve the objectives of the redevelopment plan:

1. Examine thoroughly the existing conditions within the target area, and of the needs and desires of current area residents.

2. Acquire and clear deteriorating and dilapidated structures and assemble land for sale for redevelopment.

3. Provide relocation assistance to residents and businesses displaced as a result of public actions in accordance with the city’s relocation policy. Every effort shall be made to relocate those residents and business that request it within the target area, in accommodations which are adequate, safe and sanitary.

4. Clear structures which are substandard, incompatible with the land use objectives, and/or necessary for parcel assemblage and redevelopment.

5. Remove or install public improvements as required to achieve plan objectives.
What were the long and short-term objectives identified by the citizen steering committee?

In 1978, a citizen steering committee was appointed by the Planning Commission to study housing, community facilities, transportation, open space, and redevelopment needs. In 1979, based on the study’s conclusions, the committee recommended long and short-term objectives for the area. These objectives were used in preparing the Redevelopment Plan.

Citizen Steering Committee Long-Term Objectives:

1. Bring housing up to code and remove dwelling units not feasible for repair.
2. Improve level of home maintenance in the neighborhood and make area attractive to development.
3. Eliminate or screen incompatible land uses.
4. Develop neighborhood implementation programs (i.e., neighborhood clean up).
5. Eliminate or minimize vacant lot hazards.
6. Improve appearance of area businesses.
7. Resolve animal control complaints in accordance with city policy and ordinance.
8. Provide news media with positive stories on revitalization efforts.
9. Development land use plan and rezone land where feasible to promote residential construction.
10. Provide small and minority businesses with counseling and loans.
11. Place TAB residents in training programs and jobs.
12. Increase accessibility by expanding transit service and improving street network.
13. Beautify by cleaning streets and alleys.
15. Provide 24-hour access or service to medical facilities.
16. Fully develop parks and expand recreational facilities.
17. Develop a shopping center.
18. Expand library services.
19. Develop more social services and provide programs for disabled citizens.
20. Improve streets, sidewalks, irrigation ditches, street lights, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and construct bridges.

Citizen Steering Committee Short-Term Objectives:

1. Infrastructure improvements (i.e., water and sewer lines, streets, sidewalks, and irrigation ditches).
2. Housing rehabilitation (i.e., blight elimination, rehabilitation loan pool, urban homesteading and purchase/rehabilitation, and site office operation).
3. Recreation facilities (i.e., Hayden Park expansion, Momo Park improvement, Hermoso Park improvement, and Nueve Park improvement).
4. Economic development (i.e., job clearing center, small business technical assistance, and commercial rehabilitation loans).
5. Service Center (i.e., Family Violence Center, Youth Recreation Center and expansion of Human Resource Center #1).

What have the expenditures been for actions pursuant to the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan?

Since the beginning of the redevelopment plan, the city has linked over $17 million of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds with programs and plan objectives to stabilize, develop, and revitalize Target Area B. In addition, bond funds and private investment monies has been used to provide maximum leveraging. Most of the funding has been used to eliminate blighted conditions, provide housing rehabilitation, expand park sites, and make infrastructure improvements to streets, sidewalks, sewer lines, storm sewers. The overall expenditures in TAB have been approximately $25,907,152 (see Neighborhood Revitalization Programs and Funding List, Figure 55). In 1978, the estimated total amount needed to redevelop Target Area B was $38,651,000.
This amount was identified in the “Total Program Need in Target Area B by Subareas” report developed by the Citizen Steering Committee (see Figure 52).

**How did the Plan’s goals and performance objectives change in 1985?**

The Plan’s goals and performance objectives remained the same in 1985. However, the Plan was amended in 1985 to include a proposed land use map. The proposed map indicated some substantial changes from the Phoenix General Plan map. A reduction of commercial uses along Broadway Road from 7th Avenue to 22nd Street; a reduction of high-density multifamily residential along Southern Avenue between 7th Avenue and Central Avenue; an increase in public/quasi-public uses throughout the area and a decrease in industrial uses; commercial and multifamily on the northwest corner of 24th Street and Southern Avenue were proposed. In addition, the proposed land use map added a new land use category, called mixed use, that was not shown on the Phoenix General Plan map. Also, the northwest corner of 24th Street and Southern Avenue was not designated for commercial and multifamily on the amended 1985 Target Area B Proposed Land Use Map (see Figure 58).

**ANALYSIS METHOD**

In the following pages goals and performance objectives have been grouped by eight main categories:

1. Social and Economic Development

2. Land Use and Zoning

3. Housing

4. Infrastructure

5. Public Safety

6. Community Facilities Services

7. Neighborhood Revitalization Programs and Funding Sources

8. Recommendations

In each chapter, the goals and objectives are reviewed and progress toward achieving them documented. The Appendix covers the Methodology, Relationship to Other Plans, and Results of the Residents and Business Survey.
GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

What goals and performance objectives did the Plan include regarding social and economic characteristics?

Plan Goals:

1. Create a sense of community and neighborhood throughout the Target Area in order to enhance it attractiveness as a place to live, work, and play.
2. Ensure the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods and preservation of the environment.

Citizen Steering Committee Objectives:

1. Improve appearance of area businesses.
2. Provide small and minority businesses with counseling and loans.
3. Place TAB residents in job training programs.
4. Develop a shopping center.
5. Develop more social services and provide programs for disabled citizens.
6. Provide new media with positive stories on revitalization efforts.

Plan Performance Objectives:

1. Refer jobs through the Job Clearing Center (number not quantified).
2. Provide small business technical assistance.
3. Provide commercial rehabilitation loans.
4. Provide site office operation to assist in project coordination, implementation and citizen participation.

Which goals and performance objectives have been met and which remain to be accomplished? How were the goals and performance objectives?

The following 1978 goals and performance objectives were accomplished:

1. A Job Clearing Center (JCC) was funded with Community Development Block Grant from 1978 until June 30, 1981. This program made employment referrals to area residents. Approximately 439 job referrals were made to TAB residents.
2. The Arizona Small Business Development Center (ASBDC) contracted with the city to provide technical and management assistance to businesses for commercial development. According to a 1981 status report, the contract was not designed at that time to provide physical improvements to small businesses. The total impact of ASBDC assistance was limited because:
   1) the size of TAB was very large,
   2) interest rates were high, which influenced an economic slow down,
   3) the center had limited staff, and
   4) no specific quantitative goals were set for TAB.

The Center provided management assistance to 82 firms and processed 28 loan packages totaling $1,329,539 for TAB businesses.

3. In 1985, a privately developed shopping center was constructed on the southeast corner of Central Avenue and Roeser Road. However, the performance goal to construct a shopping center on the eastern perimeter of TAB has not been met. During 1995-96, design plans for a commercial retail area at 24th Street and Broadway Road, referred to as the Four Corners Proposal, were developed.

4. Target Area B residents, businesses, and community leaders continuously provide positive news stories to the media. However, strategies to implement a public relations program with area news media were not developed.

What social and economic needs have the community identified in 1997?

1. Provide greater small business support and assist smaller businesses in completing requests for proposals (RFPs).
2. Develop Rio Salado River Walk similar to San Antonio, Texas’ River Walk to encourage economic development along Central Avenue within the Target Area.

3. Develop a contact list for city programs and have Grants Compliance supervisor attend TAB meetings on an regular basis.

4. Organize a business alliance, as recommended by the South Central Avenue Corridor Study.

5. Provide job linkage with residents.

6. Develop all city-owned vacant properties for appropriate commercial or residential use.

**Population and Household Characteristics**

*Is the Target Area gaining or losing population and households?*

Target Area B as a whole has been gaining population and households since 1970. According to the U.S. Census, there were approximately 12,788 people living in TAB in 1970. By 1980, the population had increased by 158 residents to 12,946. In 1990, it was estimated that 13,216 people lived in the area; an increase of 270 persons since 1980 and 428 persons over the past 20 years. The TAB population represented 16% of the total population for South Mountain Village (80,765 persons) in 1990.

Census tracts 1158 and 1160 experienced some significant changes in population between 1980 and 1995. During that fifteen year span, census tract 1158 experienced a population increase of 1,575 people while census tract 1160 experienced a population decrease of 853 persons. The area’s third census tract, census tract 1159, experienced a decrease of only 4 people. Figure 3 denotes population from 1970 to 1995.

How do the household composition and size in the Target Area compare to those in the city? How have they changed since the establishment of the Target Area relative to the city?

There are approximately 4,206 households in Target Area B. Based on the 1995 U.S. Census, the average household size is 3.23 persons, which is higher than the City of Phoenix household average of 2.68 persons. The average household size for Target Area B has been increasing and decreasing over the past twenty-five years. In 1970 the number of households was 3,397, and the average household size was 3.8 persons. By 1980 the number of households was 3,767, but the average household size had declined to 3.0 persons.

Comparatively, the City of Phoenix average households steadily decreased from 3.1 persons in 1970, to 2.7 in 1980, and 2.6 persons in 1990. Figure 4 shows the change in household size between 1970 and 1995.

**Change in Population**

*Figure 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>-209</td>
<td>+948</td>
<td>+628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>3,404</td>
<td>+327</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>+47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>-627</td>
<td>-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,788</td>
<td>12,946</td>
<td>13,216</td>
<td>13,665</td>
<td>+158</td>
<td>+270</td>
<td>+449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census

**Average Number of Persons Per Household**

*Figure 4*

- Target Area B
- Phoenix

Source: U. S. Census.
Over the years, there has been a significant amount of change in household type. In 1970, the percent of married families in TAB was slightly larger than that of the City; with 71% and 69%, respectively. The key difference was in the non-family and one-person categories. The percent of non-family households showed zero (0%) percent for TAB, and 20% for Phoenix. The percent of one-person households was 17% for TAB, and two (2%) percent for Phoenix.

In 1980, the percent of married families started to decrease and the percent of family, non-married increased. The U.S. Census Bureau defined family, non-married as a single head of household, male or female, with children. The most significant trend by 1990, was the high increase of family and non-married households. In 1990, 33% of the households in TAB were non-married families (almost tripled since 1970), and 16% of the households in the City of Phoenix were non-married families (almost doubled since 1970). Poverty rates tend to be higher in single-headed households with children. Figure 5 shows the percentage of household type and size from 1970 and 1990.

How does the age composition of the population compare to that of the city? How has it changed since establishment of the Target Area relative to itself and the city?

The population group identified as "under age 18" showed an increase for tract 1158 and a decrease in population for census tract 1160. Between 1980 and 1990, population "under 18 years" for census tract 1158 increased from an estimated 1,665 to 2,021 persons, an increase of 356 people. During the same period of time, population "under 18 years" for census tract 1160 decreased from 1,923 to 1,429 persons, which is a decline of 494 persons.

Between 1980 and 1990, population between the age of 25 and 44 has showed an increase of 484 persons for census tract 1158. The "24 to 44" age category, together with the "under age 18", category made up 89% of the population increase for census tract 1158. There was an apparent increase in population "under 5 years" for census tract 1158 by 1990. It appears that most of the births for Target Area B between 1980 and 1990 occurred in this census tract. Figure 6 on the following page shows percentage of population by age group.
How does the ethnic composition of the population compare to that of the city? How has it changed since the establishment of the Target Area relative to itself and the city?

Ethnic composition in TAB is considerably diverse compared to the City of Phoenix. In 1995 approximately 90% of TAB’s population was minority, compared to 35% for the city.

Since 1970, the White population in TAB has steadily decreased from 39% in 1970, to 23% in 1980, to 14% in 1990, and 10% in 1995. While the White population has decreased, the Hispanic population has increased from 24% in 1970, to 36% in 1980, 53% in 1990, and 62% in 1995. The Black population has been declining since 1980 in TAB. It rose three percent in 1980 to 38%, and then declined by six percent in 1990 to 32%; and again in 1995 to 27%. In 1995, Blacks made up only 5% of the city’s population.

Native American/Asian/Pacific population has been consistent with the city’s, with one percent (1%) in TAB since 1970, and two (2%) percent in the city. Figure 7 shows the percentage of population ethnicity by TAB census tracts.

In 1995, persons of Hispanic origin made up 62% of Target Area B population, compared to 26% for the City Phoenix. The U.S. Bureau of Census states that persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race. The census defines origin as the ancestry, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. Figure 8 on the following page shows an ethnic comparison for TAB and the city.
What percentage of persons in the Target Area speak a primary language other than English?

According to the 1990 U.S. Census, approximately 50% of the population five years and older spoke a primary language other than English.

Education and Schools

How do the Target Area’s educational attainment rates compare to those of the city? How have the rates changed since establishment of the Target Area?

The percent of adult residents (age 25 years and older) in TAB that had graduated from high school increased from 21% in 1970 to 27% in 1980. The percentage of high school graduates decreased to 19% in 1990.

Although there was a decline in high school graduates, there was a rise in the number of adults residents who had some college education. In 1970, 13% of the area residents had some college education. That percentage climbed to 16% in 1980, and 20% in 1990. However, the percent of college graduates has changed very little over the past twenty years. Comparatively, the number of college graduates has steadily increased in the City of Phoenix from 12% in 1970 to 16% in 1980, and 20% in 1990. Figure 9 shows educational attainment by census tract; Figure 10 on the following page shows attainment for TAB and the city from 1970 to 1990.

What elementary schools serve the Target Area?

There are three elementary schools and one middle school serving the Target Area: Sunland (K-8), Rose Linda (K-8), Martin Luther King Jr. (K-4), and Percy Julian (5-8). These schools are...
What is the ethnic composition of the student at these schools? How has this changed since establishment of the Target Area?

During the 1996-97 enrollment year, student ethnicity for each school was estimated as shown in Figure 12.

### 1996-97 STUDENT ETHNIC COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native Amer.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunland</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Linda</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. King</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Julian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Native American and Asian populations were so few they are estimated at 0%.

Source: Roosevelt School District

How many students are enrolled in these schools? How has this changed since establishment of the Target Area?

Figure 11 indicates student enrollment at TAB schools. Enrollment has increased and decreased at these schools since TAB was established.

## ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Student Enrollment 1970</th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Classroom Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunland</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Linda</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. King</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Julian</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, AZ, 1996

How do the test scores of these schools compare to the school district and/or Maricopa County averages? How has this changed since establishment of the Target Area?

Students in the third and eighth grades were tested on their achievement of the Arizona Essentials Skills using district-selected assessments. An Essential Skills Completion Report (ESCR) was compiled by each school to indicate the percentage of students meeting achievement standards determined by the district for competency in reading, mathematics and writing skills.

Each subject area for each grade has several clusters of skills which are tested separately throughout the school year until mastery is achieved. For each cluster the standard to be met is given as a percentage of the possible points on the test. Figures 13 and 14 on the following page show achievement skills for grade 3 for each school, and grade 8, respectively.

part of the Roosevelt School District. In general, students from the area attend South Mountain High School. There are three Private/Charter Schools in TAB: Esperanza Montessori Academy, NFL YET Academy, and Teen Choice Leadership Academy. (See Figure 44, Public Facilities Map for the location of schools.)
How many “at risk” students are enrolled at these schools? How has this changed since establishment of the Target Area?

Based on certain “at risk” indicators, it is estimated that as high as 93% of student enrollment in some TAB schools have characteristics of being “at risk”. These indicators include: attendance/absentee rates, Limited English Proficiency (LEP), socioeconomic status based on family participation in the free and reduced lunch programs, low standardized test scores, and mobility indexes.

As one “at risk” indicator, recording attendance and absenteeism (percent of student population attending on a given day), can be used to help measure the amount of academic instruction needed for each student. Students who miss valuable learning and instructional information from chronic absenteeism or due to transferring in and out of school (defined as the mobility rate) are at a higher level of being at risk. In addition, the ability to speak and read English determines student academic performance and the ability to compete in a predominantly English speaking society. Many schools provide Limited English Proficiency classes to students who have a limited capacity for speaking English. Because the district has a high percentage of Hispanic population, Spanish is often a primary language and English is often used as a secondary language. Limited English Proficiency can determine the educational achievement of students. The Roosevelt District provides Limited English Proficiency (LEP) classes which give students who have a limited capacity to
speak English a greater chance to compete and succeed. In 1996, there were 3,769 students participating in Limited English Proficiency classes in the Roosevelt School District.

Another “at risk” indicator that helps determine the socioeconomic status of students is by looking at income guidelines established for free and reduced lunches. These guidelines indicate if a student’s family is in poverty. To be eligible for the free lunch program, a family income must be at 130% of the federal poverty guidelines and 180% of the guidelines for reduced lunch. Figure 15 indicates percentage of students at-risk by factor by school.

### 1995-96 AT RISK STUDENT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Free/ Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Attendance Rate</th>
<th>Limited English Proficient</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
<th>Adjudicated Through Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunland</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Linda</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>(not given)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. King</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Julian</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Phoenix Youth and Education Office

What types of city and school programs are available at these schools?

**Sunland School:** In the 1996-97 academic year, the city has sponsored the PRL-Prevention & Enrichment Program, Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT), Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), School Resource Officer (SRO), and Urban Survival Schools.

**Rose Linda School:** In the 1996-97 academic year, the city has sponsored the PRL-Prevention & Enrichment Program, Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT), Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), School Resource Officer (SRO), and Urban Survival Schools.

**Martin Luther King Jr. School:** In the 1996-97 academic year, the city has sponsored the Urban Survival Schools.

The school offers the following programs: Bilingual Magnet, Gifted Magnet, Special Education, Head Start, Project Start All-Day Kindergarten, Regular Program Half-Day Kindergarten, and School-wide Chapter I Program. In addition to the programs offered above, the school offered the following programs during the 1994-95 academic year: Urban Systemic Initiative, Gifted Bilingual, At-Risk Preschool, English as a Second Language (ESL), and School Recycling.

**Percy Julian:** In the 1996-97 academic year, the city has sponsored the PRL-Prevention & Enrichment Program, Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT), Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), and School Resource Officer (SRO).

The school offers the following programs: Urban Systemic Initiative, Bilingual Education, On-site Special Education, and Magnet Programs for gifted and bilingual students.

Have these schools received any honors or awards?

**Sunland School:** CHAMPS National Art Contest (Student Awarded)-1995.

**Rose Linda School:** Student of the Month, Principal’s Honor Roll, Student Perfect Attendance, Staff Perfect Attendance.

**Martin Luther King Jr. School:** Fourth Grade Essay Winner, School Achievement (1990-91-92).

**Percy Julian:** No honors or awards were reported for Percy Julian.

Do these schools have any community partnerships?

**Sunland School:** The school has established community partnerships with the following corporations and organizations: Project to Improve Minority Education (PRIME), Running Start (1992), Project PRIME (1994), Arizona Science Center (1995).
**Social and Economic Development**
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---


**Martin Luther King Jr. School:** The school has established community partnerships with the following corporations and organizations: Junior Achievement (JA) (1992), Running Start (1992).

**Percy Julian:** Junior Achievement (JA) (1992), Running Start (1992), Project to Improve Minority Education (PRIME) (1992), and Project PRIME (1994).

**What are the concerns and needs of the Roosevelt School District related to these schools?**

Figure 16 indicates past and current concerns and needs identified by the Roosevelt School District.

---

**Economic Characteristics**

How does the median household income of the Target Area compare to that of the City? How has median household income changed since the establishment of the Target Area?

There was a moderate rise in the median household incomes for Target Area B between 1980 to 1990. Nevertheless, household incomes have remained much lower than the City's median household income. In 1980, the median household income in TAB was $11,291 and the median household income in the city was $17,419. At that time, incomes in TAB were approximately 65% of the city’s median household income. In 1990, the median household income in TAB was approximately $15,567 compared to $29,291 in the City. Thus, TAB's median household income was equivalent to 53% of the city’s median household income. The median income for Phoenix increased to $32,950 in 1995. The 1995 median income for TAB is not available.

**What is the distribution of major income groupings in the Target Area?**

The distribution of major income groupings indicate that, TAB household income groups are not keeping up with the city’s income groups. In 1990, almost half the households in TAB, 49%, had an income of less than $15,000, while 23% of the City’s households made less than...
$15,000. Household income groups, $15,000 to $29,999 and $30,000 to $50,000, are consistent between TAB and the city; at 30% and 15% for TAB, and 28% and 16% for the city, respectively. The $50,000 and over income distribution group also shows TAB not keeping up with the city's income group. In 1990, only two percent (2%) of Target Area residents made $50,000 and over, while 34% of the city's households made more than $50,000. Figure 17 shows median household income by census tract, and Figure 18 compares income groupings for TAB and the city.

**MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY CENSUS TRACT**

**Figure 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>$5,924</td>
<td>$10,864</td>
<td>$12,687</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>$6,031</td>
<td>$11,230</td>
<td>$18,717</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>$7,179</td>
<td>$11,779</td>
<td>$15,298</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$8,260</td>
<td>$17,419</td>
<td>$29,291</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census

**HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

**Figure 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target Area B</th>
<th>Phoenix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969*</td>
<td>TAB PHX</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000-$29,999</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000-$49,999</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;$50,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>TAB PHX</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000-$29,999</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000-$49,999</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;$50,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>TAB PHX</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000-$29,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000-$49,999</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;$50,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census. *Note: Income range between $25,000 and $49,999 not delineated in 1969.
By 1995, 35% of TAB households made an income of less than $15,000, compared to 14% of the city’s households. Again, the household income distribution group $40,000 and over shows a substantial gap with only 5% of TAB’s households, and 25% of the city’s households making $40,000 and over.

What percentage of persons living in the Target Area are below the poverty level as defined by the census? How does this compare to the city? How has this percentage changed since the establishment of the Target Area?

The number of households living below the poverty level in TAB has risen since 1970. In 1970, 20% of all TAB households were living below the poverty level. In 1980, 29% were below the poverty level. By 1990, 37% of all households in TAB were below the poverty level. In comparison, the number of TAB households living below the poverty level in 1990 was almost 3 times higher than the city average of 12%.

The level of household poverty is shown in Figure 19.

Of the 3,905 households in TAB in 1990, 1,443 households (37%) were identified as living in poverty. The 1990 U.S. Census used a median household income of less than $25,000 as an indicator of poverty. Census tract 1158 had the highest number of households, 668, earning less than $25,000. A total of 2,310 (59%) of all households in TAB receive some type of Public Assistance Income, including Social Security and retirement income, in 1990.

### HOUSEHOLDS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

*Figure 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>144%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAB Total</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Total</td>
<td>22,072</td>
<td>31,576</td>
<td>45,207</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census
GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

What goals and performance objectives did the redevelopment plan include regarding land use and zoning?

Plan Goals:

1. Ensure the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well being of persons, neighborhoods and preservation of the environment.
2. Eliminate environmental deficiencies, including small and irregular lot subdivisions, incompatible land uses, and inadequate street layout.
3. Remove impediments to land disposition and development through assembly of land into reasonably sized and shaped parcels served by improved public utilities.

In order to achieve the Plan Goals the following planning principles from the Plan should be applied.

- The Land Use Plan should acknowledge the existing private and public use of land throughout the Target Area at the prevailing land use intensity.
- The Land Use Plan should recognize the inherent incompatibility of certain land uses and strive to segregate those that are potentially incompatible.
- The Land Use Plan should foster a diversity of housing types based upon the diverse neighborhood characteristics existing throughout the Target Area.
- The Land Use Plan should foster aesthetically pleasing commercial areas which are conveniently situated and designed for the ease and safety of pedestrian and vehicular access.
- The Land Use Plan should ensure that all new and existing housing will be served to the best possible extent by adequate commercial, recreational, educational, social and transportation facilities, as well as employment opportunities. In keeping with sound planning principles, the redevelopment plan attempts to achieve a balance of employment opportunities and residential development.

Citizen Steering Committee/Performance Objectives:

1. Develop land use plan and rezone land where feasible to promote residential construction.
2. Eliminate or screen incompatible land uses and zoning districts.
3. Eliminate or minimize vacant lot hazards.

Which land use and zoning goals and performance objectives have been met and which remain to be accomplished? How were the goals and objectives met?

Many of the land use and zoning performance objectives have been addressed through zoning enforcement, demolition and clean up efforts, and land use acquisition and development. However, many of the objectives still need to be addressed in TAB.

1. The land use and zoning performance objective to develop a land use plan for TAB has been accomplished. Since the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan was established in 1978, there have been three land use plans developed for the area:
   1) TAB Land Use Plan,
   2) 1985 Land Use Map, an amendment to the original plan, and
   3) South Central Avenue Corridor Plan.

Neither the 1985 Land Use Map or the South Central Avenue Corridor Plan was converted into General Plan Amendments.

Requests have been made by residents to expand the Target Area to include the north side of Broadway Road to Pueblo Avenue, 7th Avenue to 24th Street. Expansion of the area would provide redevelopment opportunities for both sides of a major arterial street to stimulate future redevelopment activities.
2. Based on the existing land uses, there are a number of zoning districts in TAB that are inappropriately classified. Even though 47% of the land is developed with single-family residential uses, approximately 44% of the land is zoned multifamily residential, which would allow a maximum density of 19,503 housing units. The 1996 land use survey indicates that only four percent (4%) of the land is developed with multifamily residential land uses. In addition, there is a substantial amount of vacant land, 492 acres, in the area that has the potential of being developed for housing and commercial uses. Many of these vacant infill properties are used for illegal dumping (containing broken glass bottles and trash) and contribute to the blighted situation in TAB. Land use strategies need to be developed and implemented to eliminate the potential of incompatible zoning districts in the area to encourage better quality housing.

3. The city has assisted in eliminating vacant lot hazards and incompatible land uses through demolition and clean up efforts with CDBG funds. Based on a 1981 status report, blight elimination was originally supposed to be used to enhance the Housing Rehabilitation Program by removing substandard and/or dilapidated single-family housing units. However, implementation of the performance goal changed because it was determined that the single-family housing units identified for acquisition were feasible for repair and could be rehabilitated. It was also indicated that the housing units were scattered throughout the Target Area, and the impact on the area would be insignificant for the dollars spent. In 1981-82 the CDBG Blight Elimination funds were not authorized. (See status report dated December 15, 1981 in the Appendix) According to Neighborhood Services Department records, there have been 36 structures demolished since 1982; eight (8) structures boarded up and 13 lot clean ups since 1987.

4. Property maintenance and zoning enforcement problems continue to be a major issue in TAB. Since 1990 there were 634 zoning enforcement/violation cases in TAB. Many of these cases have created blighted conditions due to problems with yard maintenance, junked cars, graffiti, debris and outdoor storage.

5. The city has conducted land clearance and assembly throughout TAB.

6. Rezone vacant multifamily residential land to commercial zoning designations along Broadway Road.

What was the land use in Target Area B in 1978?

In 1978, the area had a variety of land uses and a mixture of old and new structures. Most housing units were single-family detached, and many were constructed on irregular sized lots. Multifamily housing included apartment complexes in varying conditions. Commercial development was concentrated on Central Avenue from Broadway Road to Southern Avenue. Some of the commercial uses along Broadway Road and Central Avenue were identified during the original survey as being in poor quality. Commercial uses around the intersection of Central and Southern were described as average to good in quality. There were various illegal and nonconforming land uses, including abandoned vehicles, mobile homes, inadequate parking, and uses not allowed by the zoning district. The area was also marked with automobile storage and junkyards; second-hand stores; and appliance repair stores that displayed merchandise on the sidewalk in front of the stores. Figure 20 on the following page depicts the land use comparison and Figure 21 (1978 Existing Land Use map) depicts the existing land use in 1978.

What land use and zoning needs have the community identified in the Target Area in 1997?

1. Enforce the zoning ordinance.
2. Rezone incompatible land uses.
3. Develop commercial design standards.
4. Develop city-owned properties.
5. Expand the target area.
   a. Include north side of Broadway Road to Pueblo Avenue, 7th Avenue to 24th Street, in the Target Area; or
   b. Include the northeast corner of Broadway Road and 7th Avenue and the northwest corner of Broadway and 24th Street into the target area, and gradually bring the rest of the north side of Broadway Road into TAB.
### LAND USE COMPARISON

**Figure 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (2-4 Dwelling Units)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5 or More Dwelling Units)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi Public</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Open Space</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About a third (1/3) of the land in TAB was classified as vacant in 1978; much of this land was used for agriculture. The largest parcels of vacant land were concentrated in the southeast portion of TAB, from 10th Street to 24th Street on both sides of Roeser Road. There were also vacant, burned out, boarded up or abandoned houses, and a few vacant retail stores in the Target Area.

**What is the land use in Target Area B today?**

The **1996 Existing Land Use map (Figure 22)** shows similar land use categories and acreage to the 1978 land use map. Single-family residential, which is still the predominant land use in TAB, increased by 5% between 1978 and 1996, from approximately 791 acres (or 42%) to 880 acres (or 47%). There has also been a slight increase in multifamily residential land use of 12 acres since 1978, but the percentage of multifamily to total land use is still 4%.

The amount of commercial land use has declined since the original survey was conducted, as shown in Figure 21. The 1996 survey shows 54 acres of commercial uses, which is three percent (3%) less than what existed in 1978. In the 1996 survey, 46 acres were identified as industrial, which were not identified in 1978. Public/quasi-public uses have increased over the years due to the construction of the Department of Economic Security building, South Central Family Health Center and South Mountain Precinct, and the expansion of South Mountain High School and South Phoenix Youth Center. Parks/open space has increased by approximately seven (7) acres with the expansion of Hayden Park.

There has been a 13% decline in vacant land since 1978. This is partly due to the fact that all unused and undeveloped land was identified as vacant in 1978; there was not a separate category for agricultural uses. However, the 1996 survey reclassified vacant land to distinguish it from agricultural uses. The 1996 survey estimated that approximately 24% of the land in TAB was vacant and six percent (6%) was agricultural land. If agricultural land and vacant land in 1996 are combined, the amount of vacant land has decreased from 37% to 30%.

**What rezonings have occurred in the Target Area since 1978?**

There have been 41 rezoning applications filed in TAB since 1978. Most of these properties were rezoned from single or multifamily residential to a higher density residential use. Since 1978, there have been four additional zoning districts approved in TAB, which did not previously exist; R3-A and R4-A Multifamily Residential, Industrial Park, and Commerce Park.
1978 EXISTING LAND USE

Figure 21

LEGEND

- **Yellow**: Single Family
- **Orange**: MF-1 Multi Family Low Density (2-4 Dwelling Units)
- **Brown**: MF-2 Multi Family High Density (5 or More Dwelling Units)
- **Red**: Commercial
- **Blue**: Public/Quasi-Public
- **Green**: Parks/Open Space
- **White**: Vacant

Prepared by the City of Phoenix Planning Department 1996
1996 EXISTING LAND USE

Figure 22

LEGEND

- Yellow: Single Family
- Orange: MF-1 Multi Family Low Density (2-4 Dwelling Units)
- Brown: MF-2 Multi Family High Density (5 or More Dwelling Units)
- Red: Commercial
- Grey: Industrial
- Green: Parks/Open Space
- Blue: Public/Quasi-Public
- Light Green: Agriculture
- Dark Green: Vacant

Prepared by the City of Phoenix Planning Department 1996
Do zoning problems exist in the Target Area?

The Target Area’s zoning pattern is based on what the land was zoned in Maricopa County at the time of annexation in 1960. At that time almost half of the land, 819 acres, was zoned for multifamily residential uses; 760 acres were zoned single-family residential; and 242 acres were zoned for commercial uses. Based on the above acreage, the area was over-zoned for multifamily housing at the time of annexation. A large amount of the multifamily zoned land remains vacant because it exceeds the market demand for development. If the area were built out at such a high intensity, the population, based on the amount of multifamily zoning designated, would have tripled the existing population to over 35,000 people. During the time the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan was developed, there was no market demand for additional multifamily. Figure 23 depicts the number of acres in each zoning category in TAB. Nonresidential zoning is 15 percent of the total. Figure 24 on the following page maps existing zoning.

What use permit/variance or special permits has the city issued in the Target Area since 1978?

There have been 191 use permit and/or variance applications and ten special permit applications filed in TAB since 1978. Of the ten special permit applications, three of the applications were for care/group homes, three were for nursery schools, three applications were filed for microwave communication antennas, and one application was withdrawn for a self storage warehouse.

Do property maintenance problems exist in the Target Area?

According to the city’s computer tracking system, there have been 634 zoning enforcement/violation cases reported in TAB by the Phoenix Neighborhood Maintenance and Zoning Enforcement Section since 1990. As of March 1997, 522 of these cases had been closed while 112 cases were still active. These cases included trash and litter, illegal outside uses, excessive vegetation, unsound fences, roosters and swine, and electrical, structural and plumbing violations. Census tract 1160 reported 204 violations which was more than the other census tracts. Tracts 1158 and 1159 reported 165 and 145 violations, respectively. Although more than one case may have been reported on a specific property, these cases are not duplicated in the tracking system. In addition, more than one violation may be included in a report.

During the 1995-96 fiscal year there were 11 zoning enforcement violation and property maintenance cases opened and 216 cases closed in TAB. Comparatively, there were 29,907 total cases opened in the city and 30,914 cases closed in the 1995-96 fiscal year.

The Property Maintenance Ordinance is generally enforced on a citizen complaint basis. However, the city will conduct non-complaint based inspections in cooperation with neighborhood groups and organizations. These inspections usually involve special neighborhoods (Neighborhood Fight Back Areas, Neighborhood Initiative Areas, Neighborhood Preservation Partnership Pilot Program Areas) in need of blight elimination and revitalization, or properties with environmental, imminent hazard, or fire safety conditions that may endanger residents. During an inspection, the inspector will identify the eight most common blighting conditions defined in the Neighborhood Preservation Code. These conditions include:

1) yard maintenance which include overgrown vegetation that creates fire and safety hazards;
2) inoperable motor vehicles;
3) junk, litter and debris;
4) open and vacant buildings and structures;
5) outside storage;
6) fences in disrepair;
7) parking; and
8) graffiti.
1996 EXISTING ZONING

Figure 24

Legend:
- **R1-6** Single Family
  5.3-6.3 Maximum Du/Ac.
- **R-3** Multi Family
  14.5-17.4 Maximum Du/Ac.
- **R3-A** Multi Family
  22.0-26.4 Maximum Du/Ac.
- **R-4** Multi Family
  29.0-34.8 Maximum Du/Ac.
- **R4-A** Multi Family
  43.5 Maximum Du/Ac.
- **R-5** Multi Family
  P.R.D. Option
- **C-1** Neighborhood Commercial
- **C-2** Intermediate Commercial
- **C-3** General Commercial
- **P.S.C.** Planned Shopping Center
- **P.A.D.** Planned Area Development
- **Ind. Pk.** Industrial Park
- **CP/ GCP** Commerce Park/
  General Commerce Park
- **A-2** Heavy Industrial
- **P-1** Parking (Open)

Prepared by the City of Phoenix Planning Department 1996
Du/Ac. = Dwelling Units Per Acre Base Density
What is infill, and what is the potential for infill development in TAB?

The Phoenix Infill Housing Program defines infill as the process of developing vacant or extensively underutilized land parcels located in the mature central portion of Phoenix, which have been bypassed during the course of urbanization. The program provides incentives to construct owner-occupied housing. The program incentives include waiving building permit fees, waiving water and sewer development occupation fees, and city participation in the cost of off-site improvements.

The preliminary Infill Study was conducted by the Planning Department in 1995. This study identified 64 parcels totaling approximately 492 acres in TAB. These parcels are currently zoned for single-family residential, multifamily residential, commercial, and industrial park uses. Rezoning these parcels to less intense uses may be necessary to attract more appropriate land uses, such as single-family residential, retail, and other development that would be market driven. Figure 25 shows vacant land by zoning category.

What are the locations and types of projects assisted by the city in TAB?

The City of Phoenix has assisted in developing 19 neighborhood development projects since 1981, providing an estimated city investment of $279,371; with some projects funded through Industrial Development Authority (IDA) loans with bonds issued for approximately $7.8 million as leverage. The City provided fee waivers, escrow cost, tenant referrals, technical assistance with building permits, rezoning property, demolition, land acquisition, assembly and write down. These projects help to eliminate slum and blight, redevelop blighted properties, generate new jobs and sales tax revenue, and provide new affordable housing for residents. Figure 26 depicts the neighborhood development projects and city owned vacant land.

What vacant properties does the city own in TAB?

The City owns 21 parcels available for redevelopment. Most of these parcels, located along Broadway Road, Central Avenue, and 16th Street, are zoned C-3 Heavy Commercial Zoning District; and/or R-5, R-4, R-3 Multifamily Zoning District; with one parcel zoned Commerce Park. The total square footage of the parcels is 811,863 or 18.64 acres. Their location is also shown on Figure 26.

What type of building permits have been issued in TAB since 1978?

Most of the building permits that have been issued in TAB since 1978 have been for single-family (245 permits, which includes 72 townhouse and condominium permits) and multifamily (556 permits) housing. The number of residential building permits obtained does not necessarily correspond to the actual number of houses built. The most recent single-family housing development, Chipman Estates, occurred in 1992. This development proposed a total of 24 homes. Six small apartment complexes have been built in TAB since the plan was adopted. Together they make up 389 units; all were located in census tract 1158. They include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>No. Units</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casa De Shanti</td>
<td>5236 South 5th Street</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Place</td>
<td>222 East Cody Drive</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Del Sol</td>
<td>40 East Sunland Avenue</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona Del Sol</td>
<td>27 East Corona Avenue</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5410 South 3rd Street</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunland Terrace</td>
<td>435 East Sunland Avenue</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1985, a shopping center containing 30,352 square feet of building was built on the southeast corner of Roeser Road and Central Avenue, adjacent to the TAB boundary. The development of this shopping center fulfilled the TAB Redevelopment Plan objectives to build a shopping center in the target area. In addition, five office buildings and one medical office totaling 121,037 square feet have been built in TAB. There have also been 309,719 square feet of industrial building space built in the area, primarily along Broadway Road, 16th Street and Southern Avenue.
VACANT LAND BY ZONING CATEGORY
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NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
AND CITY OWNED LAND

Figure 26
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City-Owned Properties (Undeveloped)

City-Assisted Development Projects

1. Corona Del Sol Apartments
2. Ragsdale Office Plaza
3. Department of Economic Security
4. BF Goodrich
5. Roeser Plaza
6. Baxter
7. Bob's Meat Market
8. Eagle Aviation
9. MechTronics
10. Fiesta Bowl Float Pavillion
11. Salt Valley Lodge
12. WEEBB Enterprises
13. WEEBB Enterprises
14. Greater Paradise Church of God in Christ
15. Quality Printed Circuits
16. South Valley Physicians
17. Galaxy Business Park
18. Second New Salem Baptist Church
19. Chula Vista Shopping Center
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GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

What goals and performance objectives did the Plan include regarding housing?

Plan Goals:

1. Provide a sufficient number of adequate housing units for those households involuntarily displaced as a result of redevelopment activity so that those households that choose to may continue living in the area.

2. Encourage and assist in the provision of a sufficient number of low and moderate income housing units in a suitable living environment.

Citizen Steering Committee Objectives:

1. Bring housing up to code and remove dwelling units not feasible for repair.

2. Improve level of home maintenance in the neighborhood and make area attractive to development.

Performance Objectives:

1. Housing Rehabilitation
   - Rehabilitate 784 single-family housing units to 4-family housing units using CDBG funds.
   - Repair 283 single-family housing units by Chicanos Por La Causa.
   - Rehabilitate 14 multifamily complexes, containing 112 units in 30 structures, using 510 Demonstration funds.

2. Urban Homestead Program
   - Repossess and rehabilitate 35 housing units using Section 810 funding.

3. Scattered Site Program
   - This program was created in 1978. It assists low income families in renting single-family detached housing units based on 30 percent of their adjusted annual income. The City of Phoenix Housing Department purchases single-family homes and rents them to program participants.

Which goals and performance objectives have been met and which remain to be accomplished? How were the goals and performance objectives met?

Therefore, this housing rehabilitation component has met the numerical objectives.

2. There have been 38 housing units repossessed and rehabilitated through the Urban Homesteading Program.

3. There have been six housing units purchased through the Scattered Site Housing Program in the target area.

4. According to a 1993 status report, there have been 542 cases completed for Operation Paintbrush and 88 cases completed for Operation Landscape.

What housing needs has the community identified in TAB in 1997?

1. Provide better quality housing in TAB.

Have the number and type of housing units in the Target Area changed since its establishment?

In 1995 there were 4,430 housing units in TAB. Of that total, 4,206 units (95%) were occupied and 224 units (5%) were vacant. Owner-occupied units make up about 51% of all units; renter-occupied units make up about 38% of all housing units. Approximately half of the vacant units were for rent, while the other half were vacant due to sales, seasonal occupancy, migrant workers, boarded up units, or other reasons. The number of housing units is shown on Figure 27.
which was constructed in the early to mid-1970’s. Most of the housing units built were single-family subdivisions located in census tract 1158 and 1160. Figure 28 on the following page shows the number of housing units by the year the structure was built.

**HOUSING UNIT BY YEAR STRUCTURE WAS BUILT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Number of Housing Units by Census Tract 1158</th>
<th>Number of Housing Units by Census Tract 1159</th>
<th>Total Number of Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930-Earlier</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1975</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1988</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>3,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1975 Special U.S. Census and 1990 U.S. Census

Housing occupancy dropped between 1980 and 1990. In 1980, 93% of the area’s housing units were occupied compared to 89% in 1990. In addition, the number of owner-occupied housing units decreased from 59% in 1980 to 50% in 1990. As the number of owner-occupied housing units in TAB declined over the decade, renter-occupied housing showed a slight rise from 34% in 1980 to 38% in 1990.

How many housing units have been constructed and how many housing units have been demolished since establishment of the Target Area?

There have been 24 single-family housing units and 389 multifamily housing units constructed in TAB since 1978, and 38 housing units demolished.

What is the median age of housing units in the Target Area compared to that of the city?

The median age of TAB’s housing stock, constructed in 1963, is about ten years older than the median age of the city’s housing stock.


This assessment reviewed data from the 1972, 1980 and 1994 City of Phoenix Housing Condition Evaluation Studies, to evaluate the changes in housing conditions in TAB over time. The 1994 study was conducted in association with the City of Phoenix Housing Department and Arizona State University (ASU). Each document provided a sample survey of selected structural and mechanical housing conditions for census tracts in TAB.

According to the survey methodology, the same housing condition information was collected for certain structures each year the survey was conducted. In other words, data for census tracts 1158, 1159, and 1160 was collected by surveying the same addresses during all three study years. This methodology insured consistency between the studies.

Each housing study analyzed five key components:

1. electrical service;
2. plumbing;
3. natural light & ventilation;
4. structural appearance; and
5. home and yard conditions.

The components were given rating scores of 1, 2, 3 or 4, which corresponded to the condition of the structure as follows:

1 = Good, no repairs needed
2 = Minor repairs needed, $500 or less
3 = Major repairs needed, $500 - $2,000
4 = Not feasible, $2,000 or more
### 1978 HOUSING CONDITIONS BY SUBAREAS

#### Figure 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number of Units in the Section Needing Major Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Percentage of Units in the Section Needing Major Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7TH ST.</td>
<td>36 (29.0%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12TH ST.</td>
<td>91 (35.4%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16TH ST.</td>
<td>69 (18.9%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20TH ST.</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24TH ST.</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7TH AVE.</td>
<td>17 (5.9%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7TH ST.</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12TH ST.</td>
<td>5 (0.8%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16TH ST.</td>
<td>3 (0.3%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20TH ST.</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24TH ST.</td>
<td>2 (9.1%)</td>
<td>(X.X%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Target Area B-All Sections Combined**

- Number of Units: 309
- Percentage: 8.5%

- Number of Units: 96
- Percentage: 2.7%
One of the most significant findings concerning TAB was the decline in housing units that were characterized as in “good condition” for all three census tracts. From 1972 to 1980, the number of housing units considered as in good condition in census tract 1160 dropped dramatically from approximately 93% to only 9%. This change was the result of a large number of units shifting into the “needs minor repair” category as homeowners did not have the monetary means to make repairs or maintain their unit in good condition.

A positive indicator related to the housing conditions in TAB is the low percentage of housing units considered “not feasible to repair” or “in need of major repair”. These percentages remained low throughout the survey years. Of the 975 units surveyed in 1994, approximately 2% were rated as “not feasible to repair”. Seven percent were in need of “major repair.” Figure 29 shows the number and percentage in each condition category for each survey date.

What were the home and yard maintenance conditions?

Figure 30 provides home and yard maintenance data for 1980 and 1994. About two-thirds of the homes suffered from minor or major neglect in both time periods with a slight increase in neglect in 1994.

How do housing conditions compare by Census Tract in 1994?

Figure 32 indicates that tract 1160 has the least problems with 97 percent of the units in good condition or needing only minor repairs. In tracts 1158 and 1159, 12 to 13 percent of the developments need major repairs or are not feasible to rehabilitate.

How do the average home values and rents in the area compare to that of the city? How have these rates changed since the establishment of the Target Area?

The average home values increased by approximately 77% in TAB between 1980 and 1990, which represents a substantial increase in values. In 1980, the average home value was approximately $27,300, and increased to approximately $48,600 in 1990. The city’s home average in 1980 was $61,800, and $94,335 in 1990. The average home values in the city between 1980 and 1990 increased by 53%. Based on these values, the average home value in TAB is much lower than the city’s values, but increased by a greater percentage than the city’s. Figure 33 depicts the average value of homes in TAB, as well as the average rent price.
Average rents in TAB increased 73% between 1980 and 1990. The average rent in TAB in 1980 was about $144; lower than the average rent of $253 in 1990. The city’s average rent in 1980 was $286, and $394 in 1990. Average rents in the city increased by 27% between 1980 and 1990. Average rents in TAB have remained consistently lower than the citywide average rents between 1980 and 1990. However, the average rents increased by a greater percentage during the same time period than the city’s.

How does the percentage of owner occupied housing units in the Target Area compare to that of the city? How has the percentage changed since its establishment?

Since 1970, there has been very little difference in the percentage of owner-occupied housing units between TAB and the city. The percentage of owner-occupied housing units was at its highest during the 1970’s with 63% for TAB and 61% for the city. There was a slight decrease for both TAB and the city by 1980, with a more significant decrease by 1990. Figure 34 shows housing occupancy by owner-occupied, renter-occupied, renter-occupied, and vacant units.

How does the overcrowding rate of the Target Area compare to that of the city?

The 1990 U. S. Census indicated that 22% of all occupied housing units in TAB had more than one person per room; in 1980, approximately 20% had more than one person.

What percentage of housing units in the Target Area were vacant in 1995? How does this percentage compare to that of the city? How has it changed since establishment of the area?

Housing unit vacancy has declined for TAB and the City. According to the 1995 U.S. Census, approximately 224, or 5%, of housing units were vacant in TAB. Comparatively, approximately 7% of the housing units in Phoenix were vacant. Based on the 1975 U.S. Census, approximately 526 housing units, or 13%, were vacant in TAB, compared to the city with approximately 9% vacant units. The vacancy rate in 1975 was higher for both TAB and the city, but has declined in 1995, indicating TAB’s vacancy rate was lower than the city’s.
**Goals and Performance Objectives**

What goals and performance objectives did the Plan include regarding infrastructure?

**Plan Goals:**

1. Provide adequate public services and facilities to meet the needs of the Target Area.
2. Encourage the location and design of transportation routes, compatible with land uses and the existing street system, which will promote the free and safe flow of traffic.

**Citizen Steering Committee Objectives:**

1. Improve streets, sidewalks, irrigation ditches, street lights, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and construct bridges.
2. Increase accessibility by expanding transit service and improving street network.

**Performance Objectives:**

1. Pave 10 miles of local street surfaces, 3 miles of major streets, and 3 miles of collector streets.
2. Construct 43 miles of sidewalks. The Ad Hoc Citizen Planning Committee identified 43.2 miles of sidewalks needed in the TAB Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report (see Figure 51).
3. Install 31 street lights in 13 different TAB locations.
4. Install or replace 7.5 miles of water lines.
5. Construct 0.8 miles of storm sewer lines. The Ad Hoc Citizens Planning Committee identified 5.8 miles of line needed in the TAB Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report.
6. Install sanitary sewer lines (linear miles were not quantified in the redevelopment plan objectives). The Ad Hoc Citizens Planning Committee identified two miles of sewer lines needed.
7. Install irrigation tiling on open ditches along Wier Avenue and Roeser Road (linear miles were not quantified in the redevelopment plan objectives, however the Needs and Problems Summary prepared in 1978 for the TAB Citizens Advisory Committee identified that nine miles of irrigation tiling was needed to cover ditches throughout the area).
8. Provide additional bus routes (number of routes were not quantified in the redevelopment plan objectives).

**Which goals and performance objectives have been met and which remain to be accomplished? How were the goals and performance objectives met?**

1. The City of Phoenix has made improvements to all infrastructure facilities in TAB. However, infrastructure needs identified in 1978 Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report indicate that additional improvements need to be completed.

**What infrastructure needs has the community identified in the Target Area in 1997?**

1. Improve Chambers Street between 5th Avenue and 6th Avenue, half-street behind Sunland Elementary School.
2. Pave Montezuma Street, north of Roeser Road.
3. Relocate water lines identified on the 1979 infrastructure maps.
4. Complete irrigation tiling identified on the 1979 infrastructure maps and locate any additional irrigation ditches not covered to eliminate potential environmental hazards and water drainage issues.
5. Complete sidewalks identified on the 1979 infrastructure maps.
6. Provide additional lights on local streets.

7. Complete 7th Avenue improvements, take out median, and install sidewalks on both sides of the street.

STREETS AND SIDEWALKS

Are there any unpaved streets in the Target Area? How has this changed since its establishment?

Since 1978, most of the major arterial and collector streets have been paved in TAB. However, there are still some local streets that need paving. Of the 84,480 linear feet, or 16 miles, identified as in need of street paving in 1978, only 1,716 feet (2%), or 0.325 miles, remain unpaved. Some of the unpaved streets are located in areas where little development has occurred.

Street improvements made since 1978 included three miles of major streets, 2.9 miles of collector streets, and 10.4 miles of local streets. During 1986-1987, a three mile segment of street improvements was completed for Southern Avenue, from 7th Avenue to 24th Street. In 1989, a one and a half mile segment of street construction was completed for 16th Street, from Broadway Road to Vineyard Road. In addition, Roeser Road was paved, from Central to 24th Street; sidewalks, sewer and storm drainage improvements were included in this project. A majority of the street improvements dollars in TAB were for major arterial and collector streets; Southern Avenue, 16th Street, Roeser Road, Sunland Avenue, and Wier Avenue. However, quite a few local streets were also improved; Cody Drive, 3rd Street, 4th Street, 9th Street, and Chipman Road.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, revenue bonds, and Arizona Highway User Revenue Funds (AHUR) were used to finance these projects (see Figure 55). Figure 35 shows street paving. Almost all sidewalk needs are on local streets. Abutting property owners are financially responsible for sidewalks on local streets by City Council policy.

What is the availability of sidewalks in the Target Area? How has this changed since its establishment?

In 1978, the TAB Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report identified 43.2 miles of sidewalks that were needed in the Target Area at a cost of $1,950,000. These needs were identified on a needs assessment map. Based on that map, approximately 26.75 miles have been completed. At a cost of $10.40 per foot, the cost of the remaining 16.45 miles of sidewalks is approximately $903,334. In many neighborhoods, residents have indicated a generalized preference for street that have a rural character without development of sidewalks. All three census tracts have a need for sidewalks: tract 1158 needs 5.06 miles, tract 1159 needs 5.91, and tract 1160 needs 5.48 miles of sidewalks. Figure 36 on the following page shows sidewalks.

Does the Target Area have adequate street lighting?

The City of Phoenix Street Light Policy generally recommends that street lights be placed approximately 250 feet apart. In areas where there are crime, security and/or traffic concerns, the Street Transportation Director may determine that street lights may be spaced at less than 250 feet or existing street lights may be upgraded to a higher intensity than the typical residential street light. A site survey would have to be conducted by Street Transportation to determine the number of lights needed in TAB.

The 1978 TAB Community Facilities Needs Report determined that there were 13 target area locations below the street lighting space standards, which required a total of 31 street lights. In 1978, the following street light spacing policy was recommended:

- lighting on major streets shall be extended on one side only at 200 feet intervals (where nighttime accidents and crime statistics showed a need);
- six lane major streets and major streets having landscaped medians will have 200 feet interval lighting on both sides;
- where need exists, one sided lighting shall be provided on collector streets at 450 feet intervals;
- mid-block residential lighting shall be installed at 450 foot intervals bordering schools, parks, community centers, churches and housing projects where need is demonstrated;
1996 STREET PAVING
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1996 SIDEWALKS
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residential mid-block lighting may be installed upon petition of a majority of properties 100 feet from each side of the proposed light. In most subdivisions eight households per light would reside within 100 feet of a proposed street light. If five signatures of approval were provided and the location approved by the city, the proposed light would be installed, with the City of Phoenix bearing the cost;

the majority approval on a petition would also apply for street lighting improvements on a major street, provided the street was not included in the City’s Six Year Major Street Program.

According to the Water Engineering Division, city water lines are available in streets and/or alleys throughout the Target Area.

There were 39,600 linear feet, or 7.5 miles, of water line improvements identified in 1978. Most of the needed improvements consisted of moving the older water lines, located in alleys, to the street right-of-ways. Today, Figure 37 on the following page shows water lines completed, and improvements needed. Approximately 10,758 feet, or 2.04 miles, need to be relocated. The facility inventory conducted in 1996 indicates that future water line needs include construction of lines on 12th Street and 18th Street between Roeser Road and Sunland Avenue. Currently, these two areas are undeveloped. Figure 37 shows water lines completed and improvements needed.

**STORM SEWER**

Does the Target Area have any deficiencies with storm sewers?

None has been identified although a need is still shown in Figure 38. Street Transportation staff feel that the streets are adequate to carry the flow.

What improvements in storm sewers has the city made since its establishment?

There were 31,680 linear feet, or 6 miles, of storm sewers identified as in need of upgrading in 1978. Currently, only a short segment along Chambers Street, east of 16th Street, remains to be completed. A section on Roeser Road, from 7th Avenue to Central Avenue, that appeared on the original inventory map as needing improvements was reevaluated and deleted by the Street Transportation Department; the street right-of-way is used as a way of providing storm drainage in this case. Figure 38 shows storm sewer improvements and needs.

**SANITARY SEWER**

What is the availability of sanitary sewers in the Target Area?

According to the Wastewater Engineering Division, city sanitary sewer lines are available in streets and/or alleys throughout the Target Area.

What improvements in sanitary sewers has the city made since establishment of the Target Area?

The 1978 inventory map indicated there were 13,200 feet, or 2.5 miles, of sanitary sewer improvements needed in the Target Area. At that time most of the households located in these areas were on septic tanks. Since 1978, approximately 9,174 feet of sewer lines have been constructed in TAB as shown in Figure 40.

How does the city plan to address existing deficiencies?

Given the future availability of funds, the City expects to switch the remaining properties to the sanitary sewer system.
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IRRIGATION TILING

What improvements in irrigation tiling has the city made since establishment of the Target Area?

Most of the irrigation tiling needs identified in TAB Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report were constructed as part of the major street improvement program for the area. Approximately four miles of irrigation ditches have been covered since 1978 as shown in Figure 41.

SUMMARY OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Figure 39 summarizes the improvements made from 1978 to 1996 and indicates the percentage and amount of remaining needs. The 1996 numbers reflect what is shown on the 1996 maps which may be slightly different than the 1978 needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Paving</td>
<td>84,480 linear feet/16 miles</td>
<td>1,716 linear feet/0.3 mile</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>227,040 linear feet/43 miles</td>
<td>86,859 linear feet/16.4 miles</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights</td>
<td>31 lights in 13 locations</td>
<td>locations undetermined</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water lines</td>
<td>39,600 linear feet/7.5 miles</td>
<td>10,758 linear feet/2 miles</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td>31,680 linear feet/6 miles</td>
<td>3,300 linear feet/0.6 mile</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>13,200 linear feet/2.5 miles</td>
<td>4,026 linear feet/0.8 mile</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Tiling</td>
<td>47,520 linear feet/9 miles</td>
<td>5,940 linear feet/1.1 mile</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Needs identified on the 1979 Community Facilities Needs Report and the revised 1991 CDBG Funded Public Improvements Map
**1996 SANITARY SEWERS**
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GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

What goals and performance objectives did the Plan include regarding public safety?

Plan Goals:

- Provide adequate public services and facilities to meet the needs of the Target Area.
- Create a sense of community and neighborhood throughout the Target Area in order to enhance its attractiveness as a place to live, work, and play.

Citizen Steering Committee Objectives:

- Reduce crime and arson rates.

Performance Objectives:

- Provide more police officers and resources.
- Reduce juvenile gang activities.

Which goals and performance objectives have been met and which remain to be accomplished? How were the goals and performance objectives met?

1. Since 1978, the City of Phoenix has provided more police officers and resources in TAB. The Ad Hoc Citizens Committee identified the need for a police briefing station at 400 West Southern Avenue in the 1978 Preliminary TAB Community Facilities Needs Report. In 1979, construction was completed on the South Mountain Police Precinct in TAB, providing more effective police service to the area.

Most crime rates in TAB are higher than the city’s crime rate, except for theft. In 1978, the crime rate against persons in TAB was 50% higher than the city’s crime rate; and crimes against property were 14% higher than the city’s.

2. In 1996, there were 6.8 gang related crimes per 1,000 persons in TAB compared to 1.6 gang related crimes per 1,000 persons in the city. This is indicative of high gang related activities in TAB. The Phoenix Police Department and the Equal Opportunity Department Youth Programs Division have implemented Gang and Dropout Prevention Programs to avert gang activity and make citizens more aware of what is going on in their neighborhoods. The Police Crime Prevention Division introduced the Anti-Gang Initiative Program in TAB in 1996. In recent years programs have included: Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), Gang Task Force, New Turf Project, Drug Free Zones, Neighborhood Fightback, and Neighborhood Block Watch.

What public safety needs have the community identified in the Target Area in 1997?

1. Provide more police officers and resources, and continue partnership between Police and Zoning Enforcement.
2. Conduct more undercover police operations.
3. Provide housing incentives for police officers to live in the area.
4. Organize more block watches, better coordination, and neighborhood participation in reporting crime.
5. Secure vacant structures.
6. Provide programs/classes at elementary schools to deter crime and gang activities at an early age.
7. Provide more youth programs.
POLICE PROTECTION

What police precinct serves the Target Area?

The South Mountain Precinct, located at 400 West Southern Avenue, serves TAB. This precinct began in 1977, and provided more effective police services to the area. In 1990, a new precinct building was constructed on the same site. Within the target area, police patrol grids include ADE2732 and AE 27-32. These grids correspond to census tracts 1158, 1159 and 1160.

The Southern Command Station located north of TAB on south Central Avenue was built in 1990 and serves the greater Phoenix area. It included specialty units such as the Neighborhood Response Unit, Burglary Detectives, and Motorcycle Unit.

Have crime rates for the Target Area been increasing or decreasing over the last three years? How does this compare to increases and decreases with the city’s rates?

The citywide crime rate has increased approximately 4% over the last three years (1994-1996), while TAB’s crime rate has increased approximately 14%. There is greater increase in crime occurring in TAB compared to the overall city.

What crime rates for the Target Area are more than 10% above or below the city average?

In 1996 in TAB, robbery, aggravated assault, rape/sexual assault, homicide, burglary, auto theft, domestic violence, gang related, and drug crime were significantly higher than the city average. Aggravated assault, homicide, and gang related rates were more than double the city average. The Target Area showed no crime rates below 10% of the city’s average in 1996. Calls for police service were approximately 68% more than the city’s average in 1996, and 71% more in 1995. Figure 43 on the following page shows the number of crimes per 1,000 persons.

Figure 42 shows crimes by grid ranking.

Has the city established any crime prevention programs in the Target Area?

There have been two Fight Back neighborhoods, Hayden and People United, established in TAB, and three neighborhood block watch; AMC, Park South, and Southern Estates. The Phoenix Police Department has initiated the Anti-Gang Initiative to serve TAB in 1996.

### TARGET AREA B CRIMES BY GRID RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD27</td>
<td>Rooser Rd. - South Ave./7th Ave. - Central Ave.</td>
<td>158T 106T 139T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD28</td>
<td>Rooser Rd. - South Ave./Central Ave. - 7th St.</td>
<td>70T 66T 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD29</td>
<td>Rooser Rd. - South Ave./7th St. - 12th St.</td>
<td>196T 152T 160T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD30</td>
<td>Rooser Rd. - South Ave./12th St. - 16th St.</td>
<td>199T 232T 180T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD31</td>
<td>Rooser Rd. - South Ave./16th St. - 20th St.</td>
<td>241T 255T 253T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD32</td>
<td>Rooser Rd. - South Ave./20th St. - 24th St.</td>
<td>307T 294T 287T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE27</td>
<td>Broadway Rd. - Rooser Rd./7th Ave. - Central Ave.</td>
<td>178T 151T 139T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE28</td>
<td>Broadway Rd. - Rooser Rd./Central Ave. - 7th St.</td>
<td>151T 143T 80T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE29</td>
<td>Broadway Rd. - Rooser Rd./7th St. - 12th St.</td>
<td>211T 173T 144T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE30</td>
<td>Broadway Rd. - Rooser Rd./12th St. - 16th St.</td>
<td>282T 281T 242T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE31</td>
<td>Broadway Rd. - Rooser Rd./16th St. - 20th St.</td>
<td>134T 163T 125T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE32</td>
<td>Broadway Rd. - Rooser Rd./20th St. - 24th St.</td>
<td>131T 203T 118T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City Phoenix Police Department
**Fire Protection**

**What fire stations serve the Target Area? How are they equipped?**

There are three fire stations in South Mountain Village available to serve TAB. The principal fire station serving the target area is Fire Station No. 22 at 230 East Roeter Road (see Figure 44). This station is the site of the South District Office, which includes the battalion chief and staff. The station provides Advance Life Support (ALS) services, and is equipped with a paramedic engine company, ladder company, ambulance, and brush truck. There are a total of 12 full-time personnel; four firefighters are assigned to the engine company, four are assigned to the ladder company, two Emergency Medical Technicians (EMT) are assigned to the ambulance, and one firefighter is assigned to the brush truck when needed.

Fire Station No. 23 is located at 4416 South 32nd Street. This station has four firefighters assigned to the engine company, two part-time paramedics on ambulance service. The station is also equipped with a brush truck. Fire Station No. 28, located at 7409 South 16th Street, has four firefighters responsible for a basic life support engine, and two paramedics that equip a full-time 24-hour ambulance. Other equipment includes a brush truck and a radio communication tower that provides communication linkage for both the Fire and Police Departments serving southeast Phoenix. The service area of these stations is based on a one and a half mile travel distance. Fire Station No. 272, located at 3025 S. Hardy Road in Tempe, also serves TAB.

**Category of Crimes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/Sexual Assault</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Related</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Crime</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Service</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1307.4</td>
<td>1301.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Phoenix Police Department
GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

What goals and performance objectives did the Plan include regarding community facilities?

Plan Goals:
1. Provide adequate public services and facilities to meet the needs of the Target Area.

Citizen Steering Committee Objectives:
1. Fully develop parks and expand recreational facilities.
2. Expand library services.
3. Develop more social services and provide programs for disabled citizens.
4. Provide 24-hour access or service to medical facilities.

Performance Objectives:
1. Expand Hayden Park by approximately seven acres through land acquisition.
2. Improve Momo Mini Park by installing playground apparatus, a basketball court, fencing, sprinklers, and landscaping.
3. Improve Hermoso Park with active recreational activities; construction of basketball, volleyball, and handball courts.
4. Improve Nueve Park by installing picnic tables and active recreational activities, such as construction of basketball, volleyball, and lighted tennis courts.
5. Develop a Job Clearing Center (number of referrals not defined).
7. Purchase the South Phoenix Youth Center.

Which goals and performance objectives have been met and which remain to be accomplished? How were the goals and performance objectives met?

1. Most of the performance goals for community facilities have been met in Target Area B. A new Human Resource Center is scheduled to start construction during the fall of 1997.
2. Improvements have been made to all parks within TAB. Additional improvements are needed to provide furniture, lighting, restrooms, drinking fountains, playground apparatus, and sidewalks and more parking lots. Hayden Park was expanded in 1979 and 1980 by seven acres. Aya Mini Park, located at 1925 East Carver Drive, will undergo improvements the summer of 1997. These improvements will include a picnic ramada, drinking fountain, fencing and playground equipment.
3. The South Phoenix Youth Center was purchased and began operation in 1980.
4. Jesse Owens Memorial Medical Center has reduced its operation from providing overnight care to emergency outpatient service. However, the South Central Family Health Center, serving the South Mountain Village since 1974, constructed new facilities in 1992. This health center is part of the Maricopa Health System, which is an integrated health care and delivery network made up of 11 Primary Care Centers. The main campus for these Centers is located at the Maricopa Medical Center, a full service hospital.
5. A Job Clearing Center (JCC) was funded with Community Development Block Grant from 1978 until June 30, 1981. This program made employment referrals to area residents. Approximately 439 job referrals were made to TAB residents.
6. Additional social services are needed to provide programs for elderly and disabled residents. The Senior Center at South Mountain Community Center, located at 212 East Alta Vista Road, offers programs at the center to meet the needs of elderly and physically challenged population.
What community facilities needs has the community identified in the area in 1997?

1. Construct a swimming pool at Hayden Park.
2. Construct a mini bus terminal similar to the one in Sunnyslope at Central Avenue and Broadway Road on one of the city’s properties.
3. Extend the proposed light rail transportation system within TAB, along Central Avenue south to Southern Avenue.
4. Improve the bus route timing intervals.
5. Extend the library hours.

PARKS, RECREATION AND LIBRARY

What city parks serve the Target Area?

There are two community parks, one neighborhood park, and two mini parks in Target Area B: Hayden, Hermoso, Nueve, Momo, and Aya, respectively. These parks are operated and maintained by the City of Phoenix Parks, Recreation and Library Department (PRLD). The map of Public Facilities, Figure 44, on the following page shows their location.

What recreation programs are provided at the parks? How has the level of Park services changed since the establishment of the area?

There are numerous recreational programs provided by PRLD at each of the park facilities (see Figure 45). Many of the needs identified in the original 1978 Community Facility Report have been implemented. However, since then additional needs have been identified. Hayden Park was expanded by seven acres. Active recreational activities were install at Neuve and Momo Parks.

What recreational programs are operated by PRLD at other locations near the Target Area?

El Reposo Park is the closest community park outside the Target Area serving TAB with recreational programs and activities. It is located at 502 East Alta Vista Road, south of TAB directly west of the Roosevelt School District Office. This park is approximately 24 acres and the site of the South Mountain Community Center. El Reposo Park provides many active recreational activities: tennis, soccer, football, softball, basketball, swimming and playground apparatus. The South Mountain Community Center offers special interest classes, adult, elderly and disabled citizen programs.

What community center serves the Target Area? What services does it provide?

South Phoenix Youth Center

The South Phoenix Youth Center (SPYC) is located at 5245 South 7th Street, adjacent to South Mountain High School. It was established and has been operated by the City of Phoenix Parks, Recreation and Library Department since 1980. The purpose of the youth center is to promote the positive development of teens in South Mountain Village. The South Phoenix Youth Center collaborates with South Mountain High School and other community and governmental agencies to provide educational, recreational, employment, counseling and prevention services. Most of the programs are funded by COMCARE Services, Inc., through the Arizona Department of Health Services, and by the City of Phoenix. The center has a total of three full-time and seven part-time staff. An average of 300 teens between the ages of 13 and 21 participate in youth center programs on a daily basis. The center also provides a junior model and dance program that serves youth between the ages of six and twelve.

South Mountain Village Community Center

The South Mountain Community Center is the closest community center to TAB. Located at El Reposo Park, it is a multi-use center for youth, adults, and elderly residents. The center has exercise classes, basketball courts, karate classes, and bingo night; it is also the site of the monthly South Mountain Village Planning Committee meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hayden Park Activities</th>
<th>1978 Needs</th>
<th>1996 Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized Recreation</td>
<td>Replace Recreation Building</td>
<td>Recreation Building Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic</td>
<td>Purchase of (5) Additional Acres</td>
<td>Lighted Picnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadas</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Lighted Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Add Second Lighted Basketball Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Additional Apparatus</td>
<td>Upgrade Lighted Volleyball Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Spray Pad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Restroom Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Additional Light for New Park Furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Sprinkling System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermoso Park Activities</th>
<th>1978 Needs</th>
<th>1996 Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized Recreation</td>
<td>Development of Five (5) acres</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic</td>
<td>Sprinkling System</td>
<td>Lighted Picnic Ramadas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>General Area Lighting</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Additional Sidewalks</td>
<td>Softball field lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Lighted Basketball Courts</td>
<td>Upgrade Basketball Court Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Lighted Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>Lighted Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Brick in Picnic Areas with Barbeque Grills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Lighted Soccer Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Lighted Tennis Courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$486,150</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Additional Apparatus for Tot-Lot</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic</td>
<td>Eighteen (18) Picnic Tables &amp; Benches</td>
<td>Picnic Ramada w/lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Sprinkler System</td>
<td>Lighted Softball Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Lighted Basketball Courts</td>
<td>Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Lighted Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>Lighted Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Four (4) Lighted Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Two (2) Bicycle Racks</td>
<td>Additional Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Spray Pad</td>
<td>Funishings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$144,600</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Additional Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic</td>
<td>Sprinkler System</td>
<td>Picnic Ramada w/lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Unofficial Basketball Court</td>
<td>Unofficial Basketball Court w/lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Fence on Two Sides</td>
<td>Electrical Service Entry Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$111,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground Apparatus</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Upgrade Playground Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Basketball Court</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>New Ramada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which library serves the Target Area?

Ocotillo Library, located within TAB at 102 West Southern Avenue, is the only public library serving South Mountain Village and the target area. Built in 1967, it is a small library containing approximately 60,000 volumes of books. The library specializes in materials which serve a diverse, multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, multi-socioeconomic community.

What are the library resources?

Ocotillo Library has five full-time and seven part-time staff persons, including one branch manager, one librarian providing services and materials to adults, and one children’s librarian. The library conducts a “Summer Reading Program” designed to encourage children to read during the summer. Staff also visits elementary schools and conducts orientation tours for preschool, elementary, and secondary classes and publicizes what resources are available at the library.

Ocotillo provides space for literacy tutors and “English as a Second Language” (ESL) teachers. It has an active fund raising chapter of “Friends of the Phoenix Public Library” that provide programs and buys books for the library. As a unique service to the library in 1997, Ocotillo will serve as a site for Microsoft grant-based computer services in both English and Spanish which will allow residents to access the Internet, the computerized catalog system, and other databases. As one of the 41 libraries across the country chosen to receive the grant from Microsoft, Ocotillo received an estimated grant of $112,500 to equip the library branch with computers, software, and staff training. The purpose of the Microsoft program is to provide electronic technology to poor and low-income neighborhoods that lack the means to do so on their own.

How has use of the library changed since establishment of the Target Area? How has the level of Library services changed since the establishment of the area?

There have been few changes and improvements to the library since 1978. The library no longer provides regularly scheduled visits to Boyd’s Nursing Home, South Mountain Manor, Tanner Garden Apartments and Chapel Manor. However, the library has extended its hours, hired additional staff, and started a tutoring program. These improvements are consistent with the needs identified in the 1978 TAB Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report. The library continues to identify three areas of need: extending hours to include Friday, provide additional Spanish-speaking staff and materials, and provide tutoring service for illiterate adults. Figure 46 lists usage, hours, and needs.
SOCIAL SERVICES

Is there a human services center in the Target Area?

The South Mountain Family Services Center (SMFSC), formerly known as Human Resource Center No. 1, is located at 4732 South Central Avenue. In operation since 1966, the center provides services to all residents living in South Mountain Village, including TAB residents. The center is operated by the Community Services Division of the City of Phoenix Human Services Department.

The 1978 TAB Preliminary Community Facilities Needs Report indicated that Human Service Center No. 1 was in need of expansion and remodeling at a cost of $390,000.

Approximately $98,000 worth of renovations have been made to the building over the past 18 years. However, because of the inadequate condition of the existing building, designs for a new service center are underway. The center will be rebuilt on the existing SMFSC site and completed by June 1999. The cost of this project is estimated at $2.8 million and is funded from the 1988 Capital Improvement Bonds Program.

What types of services are available at the center?

A wide range of services which focuses on solving the social, physical, and economic problems of area residents are provided at the SMFSC. In addition, the center provides a Client Casework Unit Service and Young

Families Can-Jobs Program to provide information and referral services; client-directed casework assistance service and counseling; emergency financial assistance services; and bus transportation assistance for residents.

Of the 11 outside agencies that were located at the Human Resource Center in 1978, only two still operate out of the center: the Salvation Army and Head Start program. Some of the prior programs have either relocated to new facilities (NF) in TAB or other sites (OS) in TAB, or no longer exist (NLE) in TAB. Several new agencies have replaced these programs at the center as shown in Figure 47.

SOUTH MOUNTAIN FAMILY SERVICES CENTER PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1978 Programs</th>
<th>1996 Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>Head Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES-Employment Services (NF)</td>
<td>Arizona Book Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES-Food Stamp Program (NF)</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Food Bank Food Boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Primary Health Care Center (NF)</td>
<td>Phoenix Opportunities Industrialization Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People United for Self Help (OS)</td>
<td>Rio Salado Community College ESL Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Urban League (NLE)</td>
<td>Employment &amp; Training Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix South Community Mental Health (OS)</td>
<td>Unlimited Potential Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Neighborhood Council (NLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Bank (NLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to School Clothing Drive (NLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Office (NLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract for Senator/Congress person (NLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Legal Services (NLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other facilities service the Target Area?

Senior Center at South Mountain Community Center

The Senior Center at South Mountain Community Center, located at 212 East Alta Vista Road, is the nearest senior center site to TAB. It is one of 17 senior centers operated by the Senior Services Division of the City of Phoenix Human Services Department. The programs offered at the center are developed to meet the needs of elderly and physically challenged population. Applicants are eligible to participate if they are age 55 or older and come from low income households.

There is also a program, Reserve-A-Ride, that transports elderly and handicapped individuals to senior centers, medical appointments, shopping, and social service agencies. Another program, called Senior Companion, works with private agencies and non-profit organizations to provide assistance to low-income persons, age 60 and older, who choose to live independently. There are three Senior Companion Program Work Stations in TAB:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Station</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suncrest Healthcare</td>
<td>2211 East Southern Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Chapel Manor</td>
<td>2150 East Broadway Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Gardens Apartments</td>
<td>4420 South 18th Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES)

The Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) provides economic and social assistance to eligible residents of the Target Area. The goal of DES is to offer programs that provide opportunities and services to residents who are experiencing social and economic difficulties. Some of these programs include:

1) food stamps;
2) cash benefits, such as aid to families and dependent children (AFDC) and transitional medical assistance (TMA);
3) emergency assistance (EA);
4) medical assistance through Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS); and
5) general assistance.

The DES South Central Multi-Service Center is currently reorganizing their delivery of programs to a one-stop service center. It will combine Family Assistance Administration, Child Care Assistance, Child Protection Services, and Unemployment Insurance.

There are other DES sites that have programs available to TAB residents and citizens living throughout the City. Some of those programs include:

- Job Opportunity and Basic Skills (JOB) Training Program;
- Aging and Adult Program;
- Industries for the Blind;
- Job Training Partnership Act Program (JTPA);
- Utility Assistance Programs; and
- Developmental Disabilities.

Other Human Resource Services

The following resources are also available to TAB residents as shown in Figure 48.

What post office serves the Target Area? When was it constructed?

Target Area B is served by the new South Mountain Post Office Station located at 6825 South 7th Street. This station opened April 21, 1997, and responds to zip code areas 85040 and 85041, located south of the Salt River to South Mountain Park, from 43rd Avenue to 48th Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC of Arizona, Inc.</td>
<td>5610 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Provides service to persons with developmental disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ Black United Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>5602 S. 20th Street</td>
<td>Provides programs that address critical needs of the Black community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Systems</td>
<td>31 W. Carson Road</td>
<td>Provides service to children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Post Rehabilitation Center</td>
<td>5850 S. 7th Avenue</td>
<td>Alcohol housing for sober males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys Community Center</td>
<td>2454 E. Broadway Road</td>
<td>Pre-career planning &amp; job development workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County Health System Outpatient Services</td>
<td>33 W. Tamarisk Street</td>
<td>General outpatient care, home health care, counseling services, adult and child health, and dental clinic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood Central &amp; Northern AZ.</td>
<td>4615 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Health and family life education, community clinic, extended counseling services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southminister Social Services Agency</td>
<td>1923 E. Broadway Road</td>
<td>Services to low income families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain Extend School Operation</td>
<td>5401 S. 7th Street</td>
<td>Continuing Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Choice Center - Black Family &amp; Child Service YMCA Valley of the Sun</td>
<td>1522 E. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>Counseling, parenting skills and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Valley of the Sun</td>
<td>449 E. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>Child care program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1995 Directory of Human Resources, Maricopa County, 18th Edition
MEDICAL SERVICES

What hospital(s) and medical clinic(s) serve the Target Area?

The South Central Family Health Center has been serving the South Mountain Village since 1974. The health center is part of the Maricopa Health System, which is an integrated health care and delivery network made up of 11 Primary Care Centers. These centers specialize in children health care, family planning, prenatal care for women, and preventive health care programs. The main campus for these Centers is located at the Maricopa Medical Center, a full service hospital. The South Central Family Health Center was initially located in the Human Resource Center. When a new facility was built in 1992, the health center moved into two trailer units directly west of the Human Resource Center.

The nearest hospitals to the target area are Phoenix Memorial Hospital and Good Samaritan Hospital. Both hospitals are located outside South Mountain Village and TAB. However, there are three medical clinics located south of Baseline Road that provide services to TAB: Jesse Owens Memorial Medical Center, Jesse Owens Health Care Center, and South Valley Medical Center. The Jesse Owens Memorial Medical Center specializes in pediatrics and obstetrics. The Jesse Owens Health Care Center is a private outpatient urgent care facility. The center is staffed with one full-time physician, one registered nurse, one X-Ray technician, and a clerk. The center which provides ambulatory outpatient care is equipped with ten beds. Service is provided on a walk-in basis. The South Valley Medical Center is a medical office building that contains office space for individual physicians.

Has the level of social and medical services changed since the establishment of the area?

The level of social services has increased since TAB was established. A number of new facilities were constructed since 1978, such as the Arizona Department of Economic Security, the South Central Family Health Center, and the soon to be constructed South Mountain Family Service Center (SMFSC). Many of social services related to these facilities were initially housed in the Human Resource Center No. 1, since renamed SMFSC. In addition, more senior service programs have been developed and operate out of the South Mountain Senior Center. Health care services have increased near TAB with the development of the Jesse Owens Memorial Medical Center and campus, as well, and transportation service has increased with additional bus routes on all major and collector streets.
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

What transit routes serve the Target Area?

According to the 1990 U.S. Census, 5% of the area’s employees relied on public transportation or bus service to get to and from work. The nine transit routes serving TAB are routes 8, 0, Blue Line, 7, 16, 24, 45, 52, and 61, as shown on Figure 50 on the following page.

How has the level of transit service changed since the establishment of the Target Area?

There are more bus routes serving TAB today than there were in 1978. The Regional Public Transportation Authority (Valley Metro) has added four additional bus routes in South Mountain Village since 1978. These bus routes serve specific transportation needs. Over the years the route section and route numbers have changed.

In 1978, bus service was operated along four major streets and a collector street: 7th Avenue, Central Avenue, Broadway Road, Southern Avenue, and Roeser Road. Weekday hours were terminated before 7 p.m., and weekday route frequency was offered every 30 minutes. Most of the 1996-1997 bus service routes offer weekday hours until 8 p.m., with three routes (Blue Line, 0, and 24) extending hours from 10 p.m. to as late as 11 p.m. Most of the routes offer 30 minute service with three of the busier routes (0, 45, and 61) providing 15-30 minute service. Figure 49 shows the transit service levels in TAB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1978</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Served</strong></td>
<td><strong>Street Served</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Ave.</td>
<td>7th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Rd.</td>
<td>Broadway Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ave.</td>
<td>Southern Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roeser Rd.</td>
<td>Roeser Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Phoenix Public Transportation Department/Regional Public Transportation Authority
Figure 50

TRANSIT ROUTES

LEGEND

Routes Existing in 1978

1, 13, 14, 15, and 16

Routes Existing in 1996

0, 7, 8, 16, 24, 45, 52, 61, and Blue Lines

Prepared by the City of Phoenix Planning Department 1996
GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

What goals and performance objectives did the Plan include regarding TAB Programs and Funding Sources?

The Target Area B Redevelopment Plan identified programs that would benefit low and moderate income persons and special groups in TAB related to housing, community facilities, transportation, open space, and redevelopment needs. Many of these urban development programs were linked to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

There were a number of conditions characterizing TAB as a redevelopment area, thereby qualifying it for CDBG funds. All three of the census tracts (1158, 1159, 1160) within the area qualified as low and moderate income tracts. Tract 1158 was in need of housing rehabilitation as many of the houses were not built to city building codes. The area was eligible for rehabilitation loans for residential and commercial properties. Street improvements and park development were also needed. The primary emphasis in tract 1159 was on housing rehabilitation where CDBG funds were used through the Repo-Rehab Program, Urban Homesteading Program and Section 312 Rehab Loan Program. Street improvements were also needed. Tract 1160 had persistent high unemployment, many abandoned housing units, and a need for housing rehab.

Housing programs were identified as the highest priority need in Target Area B. In addition, streets, sewers, sidewalks, and public facilities were identified as high priorities for recommended funding.

Most of the implementation programs applied to Target Area B can be categorized under:

1) housing rehabilitation,  
2) blight elimination,  
3) economic development,  
4) capital improvements, and  
5) public facilities.

Figure 51 on the following page shows the Preliminary Community Facilities Needs for Target Area B as identified by the Citizen Steering Committee in 1978. Figure 52 indicates the total program needs by TAB subareas. Even at a cost estimate of $38.6 million in 1978 dollars, not all needs were quantified. For example, the cost to eliminate illegal and nonconforming land uses, blighting influences; and engineering and design costs for all projects; street lights and storm sewers costs were not included nor any costs for economic development and job training. Most of the $38.6 million identified was for housing rehabilitation and public services and facilities.

PROGRAMS AND DESCRIPTION

There have been many funding sources used in Target Area B including federal, state, local, and private sources. A majority of the long and short-term objectives of the redevelopment area were implemented through physical improvement programs and funded through Community and Urban Development Block Grant Program. The City of Phoenix Housing Department has also assisted low and moderate income persons in finding affordable housing through direct client service, financial and technical assistance. The number of federally and city assisted housing units vary from year to year, based on the programs and funding sources. The programs listed on the following page have been used.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

The following housing programs were used in TAB.

1. Federally Subsidized Units

Federally assisted rental housing is designed to assist low-income individuals and families as well as seniors and people with disabilities. This category is comprised of single-family dwelling units and multi-unit properties that are owned and operated by private entities (for profit and nonprofit), City of Phoenix, and Maricopa County. In various complexes, only a portion of units are set aside for low-income families to
### TARGET AREA B PRELIMINARY COMMUNITY FACILITIES NEEDS

**Figure 51**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Nueve Park</td>
<td>9th Street south of Broadway</td>
<td>Picnic tables, tot-lot, spray pad, sprinkling system, tennis, basketball and volleyball courts.</td>
<td>144,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayden Park</td>
<td>3rd Avenue and Tamarisk</td>
<td>Recreation building, sprinkling system, parking lot, tennis courts, spray pad, RR building, lighting, furniture.</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermoso Park</td>
<td>Southern at 20th Street</td>
<td>Develop five acres, lighting, walkways, soccer volley ball, basketball and tennis courts.</td>
<td>486,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Momo Mini Park</td>
<td>5th Street at Sunland Avenue</td>
<td>Play apparatus, basketball court, sprinkler system, fence, landscaping, benches.</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1,162,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Ocotillo Branch</td>
<td>102 West Southern Avenue</td>
<td>Extended hours, additional staff, survey users, Spanish materials, tutoring.</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home hazard education campaign.</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shelters and benches, increased bus service, redesign bus stop signs with additional route information</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Community Service Center No. 1</td>
<td>4732 South Central</td>
<td>Expansion and remodeling</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Streets Collector</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Paving 2.9 miles @ $340,000/mile</td>
<td>996,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Collector</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Paving 10.4 miles @ $250,000/mile</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Paving 3.0 miles @ 1,000,000/mile</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NID</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Sidewalks 43.2 miles @ $90,000/mile both sides of street</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiling</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Irrigation tiling 9.2 miles @ $127,000</td>
<td>1,171,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer</td>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Design construction, inspection contingencies sewer lines 5.8 miles</td>
<td>2,670,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Design construction, inspection contingencies sewer lines 2 miles</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water lines</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Design construction, inspection contingencies water lines 7 miles</td>
<td>761,000</td>
<td>3,667,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Police Briefing Station</td>
<td>400 West Southern Avenue</td>
<td>Construction completion 7/79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,936,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Recommended Community Development Program, Community Development Steering Committee, March 8, 1978.
### 1978 TOTAL PROGRAM NEED FOR TARGET AREA B BY SUBAREAS

**Figure 52**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>AREAS I &amp; II (SEE MAP)</th>
<th>AREAS III &amp; VI</th>
<th>AREAS IV &amp; V</th>
<th>AREA VII</th>
<th>TOTAL (ESTIMATE)</th>
<th>UNIT OF MEASURE</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Housing Rehab.</td>
<td>902 + 304 = 1,242</td>
<td>309 + 289 = 598</td>
<td>408 + 137 = 545</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td>$13,955,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Housing Rehab.</td>
<td>25 + 7 = 32</td>
<td>10 + 20 = 30</td>
<td>74 + 90 = 164</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td>$2,488,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied + Infeasible to Rehab.</td>
<td>15 + 0 = 15</td>
<td>1 + 7 = 8</td>
<td>27 + 30 = 57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant + Infeasible to Rehab.</td>
<td>2 + 0 = 2</td>
<td>1 + 7 = 8</td>
<td>15 + 24 = 39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Yard Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>338 + 121 = 459</td>
<td>306 + 431 = 737</td>
<td>337 + 153 = 490</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Yard Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>3 + 17 = 20</td>
<td>29 + 12 = 41</td>
<td>93 + 21 = 114</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illegal Land Uses</strong></td>
<td>6 + 3 = 9</td>
<td>0 + 5 = 5</td>
<td>13 + 5 = 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonconforming Land Uses</strong></td>
<td>1 + 2 = 3</td>
<td>1 + 9 = 10</td>
<td>18 + 5 = 23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blighting Influences</strong></td>
<td>11 + 2 = 13</td>
<td>4 + 5 = 9</td>
<td>17 + 5 = 22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Acreage</td>
<td>82 + 145 = 227</td>
<td>54 + 28 = 82</td>
<td>168 + 22 = 190</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development &amp; Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF Dwelling</td>
<td>79 + 29 = 108</td>
<td>31 + 6 = 37</td>
<td>20 + 14 = 34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant MF Dwelling</td>
<td>2 + 0 = 2</td>
<td>0 + 0 = 0</td>
<td>0 + 1 = 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Complexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services &amp; Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements</td>
<td>Hermoso - $486,000</td>
<td>Momo - $17,000</td>
<td>Nueve - $145,000</td>
<td>Hayden - $515,000</td>
<td>$1,163,000</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>$1,163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Streets</strong></td>
<td>Southern &amp; 16th St.</td>
<td>Southern &amp; 16th St.</td>
<td>Southern &amp; 16th St.</td>
<td>Southern &amp; 7th Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Collectors</td>
<td>1 1/2 - 0 = 1 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2 - 2 1/2 = 0</td>
<td>7 - 7 = 0</td>
<td>3 - 2 = 1</td>
<td>10 - 7 1/2 = 2 1/2</td>
<td>Miles*</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Ditches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 - 1 = 10</td>
<td>14 - 2 = 12</td>
<td>8 - 0 = 8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>$2,810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>13 - 0 = 13</td>
<td>10 - 1 = 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Light posts</td>
<td>$3,855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 - 0 = 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>City's costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1/2 - 1 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2 - 1 1/2</td>
<td>11/2 - 11/2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Miles*</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/2 - 1/2 = 0</td>
<td>1 1/2 - 1 1/2</td>
<td>1/2 - 1/2 = 0</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Already funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Lines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 - 1 = 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/2 - 1/2 = 0</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>Miles*</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,651,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All estimates are construction in current dollars and estimates and do not include engineering and design which adds an additional 25%.
b 7 1/2 miles of Neighborhood Improvement District (NID) have been subtracted from local and collector street needs.
c The NID will include storm sewer drains - the location and number are not yet determined.
d The NID may include some water line replacements as yet determined.
e Only those cases recorded in Zoning Inspection files.

Source: Recommended Community Development Program, Community Development Steering Committee, March 8, 1978.
receive rental assistance. Units range in size from studio apartments to five-bedroom apartments to single-family detached homes. Housing assistance includes either utilities or a utility allowance. Rents are based on 30 percent of an applicant’s adjusted annual income. Federally subsidized units also include the Section 8 program. As of January 1997, there were 343 Section 8 housing units in TAB.

Section 8 New Construction

There was one Section 8 New Construction housing complex, Sunland Terrace, built in TAB. All 80 units are for elderly residents.

Section 8 Housing Moderate Rehabilitation Program

As of January 1997, there were 149 Section 8 housing units in TAB. This is a citywide program for eligible low and moderate income families and elderly individuals. Residents are assisted in renting apartments, townhouses, condominiums, or houses owned and managed by private landlords. Participants enter into a private contract with landlords. Owners are responsible for structural maintenance of the property. South Mountain Terrace Apartments, which has 56 all family housing units, is the only Section 8 Housing Rehabilitation Project in TAB.

Section 8/236 Housing Program

As of March 1995, the Section 236 Housing Program provided 142 senior housing units in TAB, and 65 assisted units for low income families. The properties funded through this program included the Broadway House and Tanner Gardens.

Scattered Site Housing Program

Based on 1997 records there were 5 Scattered Housing Sites in TAB. This citywide program is targeted for low income families and funded by HUD. Rent is based on 30 percent of the resident’s adjusted annual income. Utilities are provided on an approved Housing and Urban Development (HUD) based allowance. Refrigerator and stove are provided. Yard maintenance is the responsibility of the family.

2. Tax Credit Properties

Target Area B has two properties, Brighton Place on Cody Drive and Tierra Del Sol on Sunland Avenue that were financed with low income housing tax credits. These properties have 79 of the 189 assisted housing units set aside for very low income families. This program provides financing for multifamily and single family apartments for families of all sizes.

NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAMS

The following neighborhood stabilization programs were used in TAB. Housing locations receiving assistance under these programs are shown on Figures 53 and 54 on the following pages.

1. Reconstruction Program (REC). Since 1985, there have been 20 reconstructed houses built in TAB using CDBG funds totaling approximately $756,421. This program replaces an existing home that is not feasible for rehabilitation with a new home. The homeowner is assisted with temporary housing while the new home is being built on the same site. The program funding is a combination of a grant and conventional loan/deferred payment loan.

2. Deferred Payment Loan Program (DPL). Since 1979, there have been approximately 478 Deferred Payment Loans issued to TAB residents to rehabilitate single-family houses totaling approximately $7,004,025 of CDBG funds. These are no-interest and no-monthly-payment loans of up to $15,000 for home improvements. The loan is not paid back unless the house is sold or vacated. A portion of the loan is forgiven each year over a set period of time. For the purposes of this report, Below Market Interest Rate Loans (BMIR), Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 312 Loans, and the Section 810/Urban Homesteading Program are listed under this category on the funding spreadsheet.
HOUSING REHABILITATION PROGRAMS - MAJOR

Figure 53

LEGEND
- Deferred Payment Loan Program

LEGEND
- Hardship Assistance Program
- Reconstruction Program
- Rental Rehabilitation Program
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HOUSING REHABILITATION PROGRAMS - MINOR

Figure 54

LEGEND
- Emergency Home Repair
- Hardship Home Repair

LEGEND
- Operation Paintbrush
- Operation Landscape
- Weatherization Assistance Program
- Reroofing Program
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3. FHA Repo/Urban Homesteading Program. Since 1979, approximately 38 properties have been rehabilitated in TAB through the Urban Homesteading Program. Many of these properties were acquired with CDBG and Section 810 monies at approximately $272,000. Through this program the city received title to FHA repossessed housing units for one dollar ($1), rehabilitated them and leased them with option to purchase after a year of successful tenancy.

4. Emergency Home Repair (EME). Since 1993, there have been 22 Emergency Home Repair projects in TAB totaling approximately $40,477 of CDBG funds. This program provides up to $2,500 in emergency repairs for life threatening safety related work for lower income homeowners.

5. Hardship Assistance Program (HAP). This program assists homeowners who are cited for property maintenance ordinance violations. It provides one time grant assistance of up to $5,000 for roofing, painting, fencing, and dust proofing driveways.

6. Major/Hardship Home Repair (HHR). This program provides a one time grant of up to $5,000 used in combination with the Deferred Loan Program to bring homes up to full standards or to stabilize a house that cannot be brought to full standards.

7. Operation Paintbrush (OPB). Since 1993 there were 546 completed OPB cases in TAB totaling $2,340. This program is funded using CDBG monies and allows up to $250 each for painting the exterior of residents homes. With prior application approval, the cost of materials is reimbursed.

8. Operation Landscape (OLS). In 1993, there were 89 completed OLS cases in TAB totaling $748. This program is funded through CDBG monies and allows up to $250 each for landscaping the front yard. With prior application approval, the cost of materials are reimbursed.

9. Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP). This grant program provides up to $1,700 of improvements to homes to help reduce utility costs. It includes: caulking, weather-stripping, and replacement windows.

10. Graffiti Busters Program. This program sends crews and donates paint to neighborhoods to eradicate graffiti, to combat criminal activity, and improve the appearance of neighborhoods.

**Small Business Programs**

1. Storefront Improvement Program. This program is funded through CDBG monies and provides interest free matching loans by the City. Qualified businesses and property owners are eligible for approved construction costs up to $12,000 to rehabilitate the exterior storefronts of commercial properties. Loan payments are deferred and loans are forgiven if the property owner maintains the improvements and costs are not passed to the tenant during a five year period.

   There was one storefront improvement project funded in TAB. This project rehabilitated a neighborhood shopping center located on the northeast corner of Central Avenue and Sunland Avenue and was completed during the 1994-95 fiscal year. Tenants of the shopping center included Del Rey’s, the Pet Shoppe, and Central Mart. The total cost of the improvements was $44,158, with the City’s share of the cost at $22,079.

2. Small Business Administration (SBA). This program provides a wide-range of services to assist small businesses with financial management, marketing, operational counseling. It also provides a Loan Guaranty Program that offers long- and short-term loans to assist new or growing small businesses.
The following funding sources were used for programs in TAB.

**Federal and City Funds**
- Home Investment Partnership (HOME) Program
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- Industrial Development Authority (IDA) Bond Program
- General Obligation Bonds (GO)
- Mortgage Revenue Bond Program (MRB)
- Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCC)

**State-Funded**
- Revenue Bonds.
- Arizona Highway User Revenue (AHUR).
- Heritage Conservation Resources Services.

Figure 55 lists all of the programs funded for TAB, the amounts, and sources. A total of $25.9 million, not counting administrative costs, has been spent over 17 years in TAB, or an average of $1.5 million per year. Expenditures were actually heavier in the earlier years. The money is summarized by major categories as shown below. Approximately $9.9 million has been spent on housing rehabilitation, $403,584 on other housing programs, $5.6 million on blight elimination, $7.1 million on infrastructure, $2.0 million on public facilities, $242,079 on economic development and $1,091,323 in contributions to non-profit organizations for service delivery.
What are staff’s recommendations for land use and zoning in the Target Area?

The following land use recommendations have been identified by staff. The Citizen Advisory Committee’s recommendations are identified within each chapter. Figure 56 on the following page shows staff’s recommended strategies.

General

- Develop a new name and identity for the area.
- Expand the Target Area B Citizens Advisory Committee to include representation from each neighborhood in the area and develop an annual work program, meeting schedule, and set of objectives.
- Conduct an assessment every five years corresponding to the most recent census year to determine changes in demographics and to make recommendations for programs.

Economic Development, Land Use and Zoning

- Focus future funding on job linkage and training.
- Develop city owned land for the following uses:
  - Southwest corner and west side of 16th Street, south of Broadway Road: market study of potential employment uses and impact of blight on these sites.
  - Relocate the auto repair facility at the northeast corner of Southern Avenue and Central Avenue and redevelop the shopping center after Safeway relocates if necessary.
  - Expand the redevelopment area to include the north side of Broadway Road from 7th Avenue to 24th Street as far north as the alley or the first street. West of 13th Street the redevelopment area may have to extend further north. An alternative would be to establish a new redevelopment area from Broadway Road up to the river from 7th Avenue to 24th Street. The latter would require significant funding sources.
  - Create attractive gateways at South Central Avenue and Broadway Road and at 24th Street and Broadway Road.
  - Install landscaping and screening along 24th Street from the river to Southern Avenue to improve the north/south eastern gateway image.
  - Rezone city-owned properties to the appropriate zones after market studies have been conducted for them. Give first priority to C-3 zoned sites on South Central Avenue.
  - Explore the feasibility of rezoning vacant multi-family zoned parcels along Roeser to single-family or R-2 zoning.
  - Pursue establishment of a South Central Avenue property owners association to improve the image and profitability of businesses as well as expansion and new development opportunities.
  - Place a zoning overlay over Broadway Road and South Central Avenue to eliminate expansion of outside storage and uses except with a use permit. This may warrant a city-wide text amendment.
  - Work with property owners to address the illegal uses the southwest corner of 12th Street and Broadway Road, the parking on the west side of 24th Street south of Sunland Avenue, and the storage warehouse on Fifth Street south of Roeser Road, and other uses.

Blight Elimination - Priority Areas for Blight Elimination:

- Major streets and entry corridors: provide the highest visibility areas for residents and regional traffic.
- Target blight elimination and code enforcement efforts along South Central Avenue from Broadway Road to Roeser Avenue which is the village core, 24th Street, Broadway and Southern which serve as major gateways. Identify specific properties in greatest need and work with Zoning Enforcement and property owners to achieve compliance with city standards. Identify funding sources or market opportunities for screening of outside uses or conversion to other commercial uses.
RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES
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Plan strategy for the comprehensive revitalization of TAB and explore what can be done to stimulate the development or rehabilitation of quality housing.

Assist first-time homebuyers to acquire and/or rehabilitate single-family homes for homeownership.

Develop public-private partnerships to construct new single-family and multi-family properties.

Help to stabilize neighborhoods in the TAB by encouraging the acquisition and renovation of existing multi-family properties.

Encourage the participation of private lenders in developing programs that address the specific needs of TAB.

What was the Priority Ranking of Staff Recommendations by TAB Committee?

1. Expand the redevelopment area to include the north side of Broadway Road from 7th Avenue to 24th Street as far north as the alley or the first street. West of 13th Street the redevelopment area may have to extend further north. An additional option would be to establish a new redevelopment area from the boundary north of Broadway Road up to the river from 7th Avenue to 24th Street. The latter would require significant funding sources and would address Rio Salado concerns. Another alternative would be to expand TAB based on neighborhood areas.

2. Create attractive gateways at South Central Avenue and Broadway Road and at 24th Street and Broadway Road.

3. Encourage the participation of private lenders in developing programs that address the specific needs of TAB.

4. Upgrade commercial uses along South Central Avenue and address housing near Hayden Park.

5. Target blight elimination and code enforcement efforts along South Central Avenue from Broadway Road to Roeser Avenue which is the village core, 24th Street, Broadway Road and Southern Avenue which serve as major gateways. Identify specific properties in greatest need and work with Zoning Enforcement and property owners to achieve compliance with city standards. Identify funding sources or market opportunities for screening of outside uses or conversion to other commercial uses.

6. Develop city owned land on the southeast corner of Central Avenue and Broadway Road: market study of potential commercial uses.

7. Assist first-time homebuyers to acquire and/or rehabilitate single-family homes for home ownership.

8. Rezone city-owned properties to the appropriate zones after market studies have been conducted for them. Give first priority to C-3 zoned sites on South Central Avenue.

Housing

Encourage new market rate single-family housing south of Roeser east of 21st Street over to 24th Street.

Lands adjacent to or near schools: these areas must be safe and secure for children and are often used as community centers attracting visitors in the evenings and weekends as well as during the school day.

Focus on residential areas around South Mountain High School, the proposed NFL, Y.E.T. Academy on Second Street, south of Broadway Road, and the area east of Rose Linda School on 12th Street.

Lands adjacent to large, vacant parcels desired to be developed as infill parcels.

Rehabilitate homes in the area south of Hayden Park, near the large vacant site at the southeast corner of Wier and Fourth Avenue.

Focus on the north side of Roeser between Ninth Street and 12th Street. There is vacant land at all four corners of 12th Street and Roeser Roads.

Lands adjacent to heavily used public facilities such as those in the village core or major parks.

Address housing near Hayden Park and commercial uses along South Central Avenue.

Focus on residential areas around South Mountain High School, the proposed NFL, Y.E.T. Academy on Second Street, south of Broadway Road, and the area east of Rose Linda School on 12th Street.
9. Plan strategy for the comprehensive revitalization of TAB and explore what can be done to stimulate the development or rehabilitation of quality housing.

10. Install landscaping and screening along 24th Street from the river to Southern Avenue to improve the north/south eastern gateway image.

11. Develop city-owned land on the southwest corner and west side of 16th Street, south of Broadway Road: market study of potential employment uses and impact of blight on these sites.

12. Expand the Target Area B Citizens Advisory Committee to include representation from each neighborhood in the area and develop an annual work program, meeting schedule, and set of objectives.

13. Place a zoning overlay over Broadway Road and South Central Avenue to eliminate expansion of outside storage and uses except with a use permit. This may warrant a city-wide text amendment.

14. Encourage new market rate single-family housing south of Roeser Road east of 21st Street over to 24th Street.

15. Address Rio Salado development in a future redevelopment area.

16. Conduct an assessment every five years corresponding to the most recent census year to determine changes in demographics and to make recommendations for programs.

17. Conduct Systematic Code Enforcement in TAB.

18. Screen commercial uses next to Hayden Park.

19. Pursue the elimination of illegal uses at the southwest corner of 12th Street and Broadway Road, the parking on the west side of 24th Street south of Sunland Avenue, and the storage warehouse on South Fifth Street.

20. Focus on improving residential areas around South Mountain High School, the proposed NFL Y.E.T. Academy on Second Street, south of Broadway Road, and the area east of Rose Linda School on 12th Street.

21. Explore the feasibility of rezoning vacant multifamily zoned parcels along Roeser Road to single-family or R-2 zoning.

22. Focus future funding on job linkage and training.

23. Cleanup vacant lot and promote economic development on the northeast corner of Roeser Road and Central Avenue.

24. Help to stabilize neighborhoods in the TAB by encouraging the acquisition and renovation of existing multifamily properties.

25. Rehabilitate homes in the area south of Hayden Park, near the large vacant site at the southeast corner of Wier and Fourth Avenue.

26. Develop public-private partnerships to construct new single-family and multifamily properties.

27. Relocate the auto repair facility at the northeast corner of Southern Avenue and Central Avenue and redevelop the shopping center after Safeway relocates if necessary.

28. Pursue establishment of a South Central Avenue property owners association to improve the image and profitability of businesses as well as expansion and new development opportunities.

29. Focus on the north side of Roeser Road between Ninth Street and 12th Street. There is vacant land at all four corners of 12th Street and Roeser Roads.

30. Construct half street improvements adjacent to Sunland Elementary School on Chambers Street and 5th Avenue.

31. Develop a new name and identity for the area.
ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The methodology and work plan for the assessment were reviewed by the Target Area B Citizens Advisory Committee, other interested citizens, City of Phoenix departmental staff. The work plan was carried out in the following manner:

1. During February and March of 1996, members of the South Team for the City of Phoenix Planning Department and Arizona State University planning students conducted an existing land use survey for Target Area B. This survey updated the original survey done in 1978. The purpose of the 1996 survey was to determine if the proposed and designated land uses in the area were consistent with the Redevelopment Plan and Phoenix General Plan.

2. Home and yard maintenance condition data was collected and analyzed using the 1972, 1980 and 1994 ASU/City of Phoenix Housing Condition Evaluation Reports. Statistics were also gathered specifying the housing supply and/or demand by type and price categories.

3. Data pertaining to capital improvements, such as streets, waterlines, sewers and sidewalks was gathered from the appropriate City departments to determine if adequate public services and facilities demands had been met.

4. Information identifying past and present programs and funding sources was obtained from the Neighborhood Services Department.

5. A list of 1978 Community Facilities Needs, housing rehabilitation activity, blight elimination goals, and capital improvement needs was generated to determine if initial plan goals had been accomplished.

6. After analyzing data from the 1978 redevelopment plan and comparing it with the 1996 updated data, specific elements from the original plan such as blight elimination, housing rehabilitation and capital improvements were identified as priorities. Each priority was then evaluated, based on the redevelopment plan objectives, on whether they met the performance goals indicated in the 1978 Action Plan.

7. The Target Area B Resident and Business Study Survey was prepared by Behavior Research Center, Inc., a member of the National Council on Public Polls, for the City of Phoenix Planning Department to determine the attitudes and opinions of residents and businesses located in Target Area B regarding their neighborhood. The survey addressed:
   - Progress made in achieving Target Area B Redevelopment Plan goals;
   - Public improvements made since designation as a redevelopment area, and satisfaction with city services and facilities;

8. Planning Department staff attended monthly Target Area B Citizens Advisory Committee meetings to present data, obtain comments, and work with residents to determine what the public felt had been accomplished since the redevelopment plan was adopted, as well as determine future needs that still had to be accomplished.

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING PLANS

In addition to the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan, there are three other existing plans which include recommendations and strategies for the area. The General Plan for Phoenix: 1985-2000, was adopted by Council in 1985. The South Mountain Village Draft Plan was developed in 1985, and is used as a guide for the village though it was never formally adopted by Council; and the South Central Avenue Corridor Study, adopted in 1993. Each of these plans serves as a general guide to City Council, Planning Commission, City staff, and residents when regarding the direction and development of the City, the Village, and TAB.

The General Plan for Phoenix: 1985-2000

The Phoenix General Plan is based on the urban village model. The village concept, adopted in 1979, is a principle element of the General Plan. The primary goal of the village model is to provide residents with a sense of
identity, as well as satisfy their need to belong to the overall community. It includes 11 General Plan Elements that promote a mix of jobs, a range of housing types and prices, public services, recreational opportunities, as well as provide a safe and liveable community environment. The general plan document and the corresponding land use map contain goals, policies, a summary of the 11 Elements, and recommendations to implement the village concept. The Conservation, Rehabilitation and Redevelopment Element of the General Plan consists of goals and policies that support the elimination of slums and blight, consistent with the goals and objectives of the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan.

There have been four amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map in South Mountain Village which relate to TAB since 1985. Those changes include the relocation of the village core to an area one block north of Broadway Road to Roeser Road, 3rd Avenue to 3rd Street. Within the urban village model, the village core components are a central focus of the village. These core components recommend a mix of uses including office, retail, public, governmental and residential uses. The primary objective of the South Mountain Village Core is to serve as a governmental services core, based on various public facilities and services located in this area. Other land use changes to the General Plan in TAB include:

1) an increase in multifamily residential land use of 5-15 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) to 15+ du/ac, located just south the commercial designation along Broadway Road between 12th Street and 16th Street;

2) the multifamily residential land use of 5-15 du/ac changed to an industrial classification on the west side of 16th Street between Roeser Road and Sunland Avenue; and

3) the northwest corner of 24th Street and Southern Avenue was changed from single-family residential at 2-5 du/ac to commercial and multifamily residential at 15+ du/ac.

Except for the four changes mentioned above, the General Plan Land Use map for TAB remained unchanged. The General Plan as shown in Figure 57 on the following page recommends commercial land use along Central Avenue between Broadway Road and Southern Avenue.

Commercial land use is proposed along Broadway Road from 7th Avenue to 22nd Street, with multifamily residential at a density of 5-15 du/ac from 22nd Street to 24th Street. The plan recommends multifamily residential at 15+ du/ac on Southern Avenue between 7th Avenue and Central Avenue, with commercial uses between Central Avenue and 7th Street. There is also a major commercial site at the northwest corner of 24th Street and Southern which is vacant. Most of the interior parcels in TAB are designated for single-family or high-density multifamily units, with the exception of the industrial uses along 16th Street, the public/quasi-public uses located throughout the target area; and the parks/open space uses.

The 1985 Proposed Land Use Map

In 1985, the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan was amended by Resolution 16510 to include a proposed land use map. The proposed map indicated some substantial changes from the Phoenix General Plan Land Use Map. These changes included a reduction of commercial uses along Broadway Road between 7th Avenue and 22nd Street; a reduction of high-density multifamily residential uses along Southern Avenue between 7th Avenue and Central Avenue; a decrease in industrial uses in the area; and an increase in public/quasi-public uses throughout the area. The northwest corner of 24th Street and Southern Avenue was designated for single-family on the amended 1985 TAB Land Use Map. In addition, a new land use designation, mixed-use, was added to the proposed land use map.

The 1985 TAB Land Use Map as shown in Figure 58 was amended and approved by City Council in January 1985, and provided more refinement of the 1979 Land Use Map. Those amendments, however, did not get incorporated into The General Plan for Phoenix: 1985-2000 Map, which was simultaneously being developed and approved by City Council in October 1985.
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE
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The South Mountain Village Draft Plan

The South Mountain Village Draft Plan appears to be a compromise between the Phoenix General Plan and the 1985 TAB Amended (Resolution No. 16510) Land Use Map as shown in Figure 55. The Village Draft Plan indicates a concentration of multifamily housing on Southern Avenue between 7th Avenue and Central Avenue; commercial along Broadway Road from 7th Avenue to 24th Street; and a couple of industrial pockets on 16th Street near Broadway Road and Southern Avenue which are consistent with the Phoenix General Plan. It also shows single-family residential on the northwest corner of 24th Street and Southern Avenue, which is consistent with the 1985 amended TAB land use map.

The South Central Avenue Corridor Study

The purpose of the South Central Avenue Corridor Study was to analyze the commercial area along Central Avenue, south of the Salt River. When City Council approved the relocation of South Mountain Village Core, a market analysis was requested to determine some of the issues and needs regarding commercial development along Central Avenue. The core for South Mountain Village was originally designated as a governmental services core due to the concentration of public/quasi-public type facilities in the area. As a means of increasing activity in the core, the South Central Avenue Corridor Study proposed an increase in commercial development along Central Avenue, from the River to the Highline Canal between 3rd Avenue and 3rd Street.

The Baseline Area Master Plan

This plan concentrates on the area bounded by Central Avenue and 40th Street; Southern Avenue to the Mountain Preserve. A land use plan was developed for the area to help guide the development of large vacant parcels and agricultural lands. The effects of this plan could be instrumental in influencing the quality of housing development in TAB as major land developers invest in the area and subsequently provide economic development.

RESULTS OF THE RESIDENT AND BUSINESS SURVEY

The City of Phoenix Planning Department commissioned the Behavior Research Center, a private research firm, to conduct a resident and business survey. The primary objective of the survey was to determine the attitudes and opinions of residents and businesses located in TAB regarding their neighborhood. The survey addressed the following issues:

- Progress made in meeting Target Area B Redevelopment Plan goals;
- Public improvements made in Target Area B over the past 17 years;
- Primary problems facing neighborhoods;
- Satisfaction with city services and facilities;
- Evaluation of the area in selected areas;
- Evaluation of economic development efforts in area;
- Resident and business demographics.

Information for the survey was conducted through in-depth telephone interviews by the Behavior Research Center between August 19, and September 6, 1996. Results of the survey are as follows:

1. Awareness of Target Area B Designation
   39% of TAB residents and 46% of area businesses are aware that they are located in TAB.

2. Areas Where City has Made Most Progress
   62% of residents and 63% of businesses in the area believe that the city made either substantial or some progress in providing adequate public services.

   - 64% of area businesses felt that the city has made either substantial or some progress in stabilizing existing viable neighborhoods.
   - 61% of businesses felt that the city has made either substantial or some progress in encouraging better transportation routes to promote the safe flow of traffic.
   - 61% of area businesses felt that the city has made either substantial or some progress in stabilizing declining residential neighborhoods.
3. Areas Where City has Made Least Progress
   - Assembling vacant land into useable sized and shaped parcels for resale and development.
   - Stabilizing declining residential neighborhoods by removing structurally substandard buildings.
   - Eliminating unsuitable land uses.

4. Current Appropriateness of Plan’s Goal
   - 95% of residents and 100% of businesses in TAB believe the goals and objectives identified in the Target Area B Redevelopment Plan are still appropriate.

5. Awareness of Public Improvement/Blight Elimination Efforts
   - 46% of residents and 37% of businesses are aware of public improvements in the area.
   - 19% of residents and 27% of businesses are aware of blight elimination efforts in the area.

6. Severity of Area Problems
   - Both residents and businesses agree that crime and gangs are problems in TAB.
   - Residents believe the lack of adequate jobs in the area is a major problem.
   - Businesses also believe that vandalism, graffiti, vacant and blighted structures, lack of residential maintenance, and declining neighborhoods are major problems.

7. Evaluation of TAB - Highest Ratings
   - Residents gave highest ratings on street quality and public transportation.
   - Businesses gave highest ratings on traffic flow and public transit.

8. Evaluation of TAB - Lowest Ratings
   - Both residents and businesses gave lowest ratings on safety, cleanliness and attractiveness.

9. Evaluation of Target Area B Maintenance
   - Four out of ten residents believe that yards and houses in their neighborhood are beginning to show signs of neglect; and one-third (1/3) of residents believe yards and houses in their neighborhood are well maintained.
   - 59% of businesses describe the physical condition of the area as beginning to show signs of neglect; 24% of businesses describe the area as well maintained; and 17% of businesses describe the area as poorly maintained.

10. Attitudes About Neighborhood Stability
    - Three out of four residents classify their neighborhood as stable; and one out of five residents classify their neighborhood as unstable.

11. Attitudes About Affordable Housing
    - One-half (½) of residents say there is a sufficient number of affordable housing; 3% of residents say there are too many affordable housing units; and 35% of residents say there is not enough.

12. Evaluation of City Services in Target Area B - Highest Rated
    - Both residents and businesses (at least 50%) said the following services are excellent or good: fire services, police service, sewers, water lines and storm sewers.

13. Evaluation of City Services in Target Area B - Lowest Rated
    - Residents gave public transportation and sidewalk maintenance the lowest ratings.
    - Businesses gave public transportation the lowest rating.

14. Business Programs Utilized
    - 12% of businesses have participated in either the City’s Storefront Program or Small Business Assistance Program.
10% of businesses have participated in the City of Phoenix Enterprise Zone (COPEZ) Program.

2% of businesses have participated in the Expansion Assistance and Development (EXPAND) Program.

14% of businesses have participated in a Small Business Administration (SBA) Program.

15. Value of Selected Business Resources

One-third (1/3) of businesses indicated the following information would be very helpful:

16. Most Effective Economic Development Steps

- Attract more businesses to the area.
- Reduce crime.
- Clean up the area.

17. Availability of Qualified Workers

- 58% of businesses believe there is a significant number of qualified workers in TAB; and 37% of businesses do not believe there is a significant number of qualified workers in the area.

18. Reasons for Locating in TAB

- Clients are located in TAB.
- Corporate decision.


- 41% of businesses say their volume of business has increased over the past two years;
- 26% of businesses say their volume of business has decreased over the past two years; and
- 22% of businesses say their volume of business has remained the same over the past two years.