

Neighborhood Center Report 2014



Revised 8/22/14



City of Madison
Community Development Division
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Rm 225
Madison, WI 53703

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Purpose of Report

Part I: The Current Landscape.....5

- Definition of Neighborhood Centers
- Neighborhood Centers - Other Municipal Models
- Neighborhood Centers in Madison
- City Supported Neighborhood Centers
- Variation in Neighborhood Centers in Madison

Part II: Funding of Neighborhood Centers.....15

- Overview of Center Budgets
- City Funding for Neighborhood Centers
 - Capital Financing*
 - Program Support and Center Support*
- Frameworks for Neighborhood Center Funding
 - Equal Allocation Model*
 - Neighborhood Center Categorization Model*
 - Cost Based Allocation Model*
 - Additional Models and Strategies for Transition Planning*

Part III: Future Neighborhood Centers.....31

- Factors and Conditions to be Considered
- Introduction to the CARPC data
- High Need Areas without Neighborhood Centers
 - Darbo Worthington*
 - Leopold*
 - Owl Creek and Liberty Place*
 - Brentwood*
- Neighborhoods Served by Existing Centers

Attachments

- Attachment 1: Map of City-funded Neighborhood Centers.....1
- Attachment 2: Neighborhood Center Descriptions.....2
- Attachment 3: Characteristics of Individual Neighborhood Centers.....25
- Attachment 4: CARPC Data on NRT Neighborhoods and High Need Areas.....27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Neighborhood centers are a familiar part of the fabric in communities across the country. Occasionally set up to support very specific activities like recreation or the arts, they are better known for their role in serving low income families and helping to stabilize troubled neighborhoods within urban areas. Centers become closely identified with the neighborhoods they serve and when they are successful, it is because they engage residents in efforts to improve the quality of life in their communities.

Neighborhood centers have existed in Madison for nearly 100 years. They are run by a collection of independent, non-profit agencies whose primary focus is on the well being of low-income families and the neighborhoods in which they live. These tend to be neighborhoods in Madison that are challenged by the impacts of concentrated poverty, racial or social inequity, crime, sub standard housing and inadequate support structures. The number of neighborhood centers has gradually increased since the late 1970's following the slow spread of poverty into new areas of the city. Today, they number 14. A fifteenth is expected to open early in 2015.

Neighborhood centers in Madison enjoy a very strong relationship with their city government that is unique across the country. The City has long provided generous financial support to help establish center facilities and sustain the programming that occurs within. In turn, centers have filled the much needed role as providers of reliable, high quality services to some of the city's most vulnerable residents. The two have worked in tandem to identify the most pressing needs facing neighborhoods and formulate appropriate responses.

While the principle focus of center programming is on serving low-income families, centers work also to strengthen relationships within neighborhoods and promote a deeper sense of community. In 2013, centers activities touched more than 90,000 people throughout the city from 70,000 different households.

The capacity to serve large numbers of people is one area in which centers vary greatly from one another. In large part, this is a function of the size of the centers. Some of them operate out of structures built specifically for their use, but most occupy converted buildings that were once used as schools or apartments. Some lease space. Facility sizes range from less than 2,000 square feet of space to as much as 47,000. For some centers, size and other physical constraints impose limitations on the breadth and depth of activities they can offer. It also has practical effects for the numbers of people they can serve. In some cases, centers make conscious decisions about their service areas but often, it is a function of capacity. Whatever the reason, these differences have implications for center budgets – both in terms of how large they are and where the money comes from to finance them.

The City provides financial support to neighborhood centers in three distinct ways – capital financing, program support and center support. Nearly every center has received financing from the City to help develop or improve its facility. The costs of these projects vary greatly depending on whether they involve new construction or renovation and on such other key factors as size, location, land cost and the availability of other funds. These variables make budget planning very difficult. The City’s 5-year capital improvement plan calls for about \$1 million per year for neighborhood projects – an amount likely sufficient to support only one or two projects per year.

The impact on City finances only begins with capital financing. Centers need help to keep their doors open to users and to pay for needed programs. The City provides about \$2.2 million each year for these purposes. The money is split about equally between program support, which pays for programming the City wishes to see provided, and center support, which covers a portion of the centers’ overhead. Both categories of assistance are allocated through a competitive process held once every two years.

Neighborhood centers are a primary recipient of all the grant funds the City makes available to help pay for human services. The \$1.1 million they receive in the form of program support represents 40% of City spending on human services. Most of that, nearly \$900,000, goes for programs that benefit children and families.

The amount of program support each center receives varies based on the types of programs they provide, the number of people they expect to serve and, to some degree, their relative need for funds. So long as they meet program quality and performance expectations, and demonstrate continued need for their services, centers know they can count on receiving these funds year after year. However, it is more difficult for them to attract money they might need to support new or expanded programs.

The situation with center support is somewhat different. The allocation process used to distribute center support is a relic of past policies and practices. It offers little guidance in setting allocations for new centers and probably should be reformed. A methodology that allocates center support on the basis of actual cost experiences, and that also takes into account some of the differences between centers, is worth considering. Importantly, if a new allocation methodology is devised, it should be implemented in a way that does not cause hardship for individual neighborhood centers. That may require additional funding or a longer transition period.

The work performed by neighborhood centers is an integral part of broader City strategies to support and preserve neighborhoods. So effective have they been that adding a neighborhood center is often perceived to be the answer for struggling neighborhoods – and a measuring stick for the City’s commitment to a neighborhood. Not surprisingly then, as issues of poverty and inequity continue to grow in Madison, so too do calls for more centers.

Decision makers will have to weigh a variety of factors when making judgments about new centers. One of the first is an assessment of whether there is a sufficient level of need. Information pertaining to employment and academic achievement, housing conditions and police activity has long been helpful in measuring need within neighborhoods. One potential new source of data is the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission's (CARPC) analysis of information taken from the U.S. Census and American Community Survey. The CARPC data promises to help shed light on the presence of risk indicators in city neighborhoods. These indicators, which measure such things as the prevalence of poverty, single parent households, and language barriers, reflect circumstances that make it more difficult for people to take advantage of opportunities that are available in the community. The data needs further refinement but upon a tentative review of some of the neighborhoods in Madison that are most often identified as potential sites for new centers, it confirms that many of these risk indicators are clearly present.

There is no easy way to decide where to place the next neighborhood center, no formula that will objectively rank them according to need. The available data should inform those decisions but so too should input from residents, City-led neighborhood resource teams, service providers and other community stakeholders. All of this information can help assess not only whether a neighborhood demonstrates the need for a center but, perhaps more importantly, also whether there exists sufficient support to ensure its success.

Above all, decision makers must acknowledge that new centers carry with them substantial financial obligations. Beyond any initial capital investment the City might need to make to establish a facility, new centers will also have significant and long-term implications for operating budgets. New centers require new money. Failure to recognize that reality does more than jeopardize a new center's prospects for success. It also runs the risk of eroding funds available to the group of existing centers. That could have serious consequences for them and for the neighborhoods they serve.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report discusses several topics concerning neighborhood centers that operate in Madison. It contains a brief description of the centers and the roles they play here, describes the financial support they receive from the City and discusses some of the issues to be considered in planning for new centers. The report attempts to respond to questions raised during past budget discussions and ongoing conversations about the need for new centers. The report is divided into three parts.

- **Part I provides a brief overview of neighborhood centers and offers a description of the group of centers in Madison that receive direct City financial support.**
- **Part II looks at some of the financial aspects of neighborhood centers. It examines how the City makes investments in centers and suggests how that approach could be improved.**
- **Part III discusses the potential need for new neighborhood centers and offers some input to that discussion.**

The information compiled in this report was assembled primarily by staff in the City's Division of Community Development in consultation with a variety of local government colleagues and other partners. It reflects input and insight offered by members of City policy committees that advise the Division on matters related to neighborhood centers and from representatives of other local organizations that work closely with centers. Neighborhood center staff and board members provided valuable input via interviews. Center directors were particularly generous with their time. Finally, the report reflects public input that was gathered through a series of community meetings held across the city.

Part I: THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

DEFINITION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

Neighborhood centers, or community centers, are locality based facilities typically set within urban neighborhoods. They exist in communities across the country. Centers fill many different roles but, most often, they serve as venues for specialized programming for a specific geographic area or population. Sometimes that focus is quite narrow, for instance, space for recreation or arts programming. In other cases, centers serve much broader missions, including as providers or coordinators of human service programming. Just as each neighborhood has its own unique character and atmosphere, so too do the centers that serve them. Despite differences in size, hours of

operation, service areas, programming and budgets, among other features, neighborhood centers share several key characteristics.

For one, they occupy physical spaces within the neighborhoods they serve. That seems obvious, but it's key to the idea that these facilities are **of** and **about** neighborhoods. They become fixtures within neighborhoods, part of their fabric and part of their identity. Whether or not centers are publicly owned, an assumption or expectation exists within the neighborhood that these are public places, open and readily accessible for community use.



The most successful neighborhood centers function as focal points within the community. They bring people together, for a variety of reasons, who might live near one another but have little occasion to interact. Such gatherings are often useful in helping residents break down cultural or socio economic barriers, strengthen relationships, recognize shared interests and build neighborhood cohesion.

Neighborhood centers can help bring stability to high-need areas. That is particularly important in certain neighborhoods where high density, multi-family housing complexes might be more prevalent and where residents move in and out more frequently, factors that often frustrate efforts to forge relationships among neighbors and build community.

No matter how a neighborhood center chooses to define itself, whether it's to support local artistic endeavors, serve older adults, deliver family oriented programming or merely offer space for community use, all share the goal of seeking to improve the quality of life in the community.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS – OTHER MUNICIPAL MODELS

Neighborhood centers can be found across the country. In some communities, city governments might be closely linked with centers, but it is more common that they are not. Moreover, where city governments are involved, there is no particular pattern in terms of the nature of that involvement. In some cities, for example Racine and Minneapolis, community centers are principally venues for recreational programming. City governments are responsible for parks and recreation programming in both communities so, not surprisingly, they own and operate the centers.

There are other examples where city governments support the work of centers that are more oriented toward providing human services, typically in conjunction with other public funders. That is the case in Los Angeles and in the City of Portland. The City of

Los Angeles owns and operates 5 of the 21 centers in that community but it receives financial contributions from county government. Los Angeles places a great deal of emphasis on how center programming measurably impacts the economic well-being of families and neighborhoods. City-owned centers have also been the hallmark of the City of Portland system, and human services a central focus of its attention. However, mounting budget pressures have prompted the City to begin turning over its facilities to non-profit organizations. And in Milwaukee, neighborhood centers are run by corporate and faith-based organizations. It appears they receive support from the Milwaukee Public School System, but the only financial aid that the City provides comes from money Milwaukee receives under the Federal Community Development Block Grant Program. There are also various cities and counties that utilize a school-based community center model. In these, the school building is turned over to a non-profit after the school day which then operates the facility as a community center. The non-profit has responsibility and authority over building usage, programs offered in the school, and the selection of program partners offering those after school programs and services. To be successful, this model takes considerable planning, coordination, communication and trust among the school, non-profits, and other public partners. However, the significant benefit to this model is the utilization of existing facilities for multiple purposes in locations that are already known and accessed by the residents they want to serve. This saves considerable capital expenditures in the community.



NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS IN MADISON

In Madison, neighborhood centers have been part of the landscape since 1916, when Neighborhood House, the City's oldest center, opened its doors to serve immigrants. Most recently, in 2012, the Center for Resilient Cities became the newest center, a status it will hold only briefly. A new center will be built in the Theresa Terrace neighborhood and is scheduled to open in early 2015.

In general, the core mission of neighborhood centers in Madison is to work with low income families in neighborhoods with concentrated poverty. Their work is widely perceived to be integral to addressing issues of economic and social distress. In most cases, however, the work of centers extends to other areas including such things as promoting cultural awareness, expanding educational or employment opportunities, and developing leadership capacity. Neighborhood centers enjoy broad community support and their very presence, in some instances, is viewed as a measure of the City's commitment and resolve in addressing challenges that arise in troubled neighborhoods. For that reason, the question of when and where to add new centers is a frequent topic of discussion among residents, city staff and elected officials.

To recognize that Madison's neighborhood centers share a common focus on serving low income families does not suggest they all operate alike. They don't. That should come as no surprise given the diversity both in neighborhood characteristics and the non-profit organizations that operate these centers.

On occasion, questions still arise over whether a particular organization or facility truly is a neighborhood center. When they do, it typically involves situations in which an organization or its facility isn't neighborhood based, or perhaps, when residents or service groups feel they lack access to a facility, or influence over how it is used. Beyond acknowledging that a few of these situations exist in Madison, this report does not delve into the issue. When it refers to neighborhood centers, that term is used to describe the group of centers that receives direct financial support from the City.

So, with respect to that group of centers, the following observations help describe the system of which they are a part:

- Neighborhood centers are not a function of city government. Generally speaking, the City does not own, operate or maintain center facilities. Instead, a group of independent, non-profit organizations are responsible for maintaining and operating centers, and managing the programming that occurs within them. The City wields some influence over centers' activities, likely in proportion to the contribution it makes to center budgets.
- The neighborhood centers that the City supports are primarily devoted to serving low-income families and children. Centers are an integral part of the local human services delivery system. They are reliable providers of high quality programming to some of the city's most vulnerable populations. They are uniquely situated to serve and engage families on multiple levels, a fact that improves their ability to have lasting impacts. Neighborhood centers have also proven effective at leveraging other public resources, and private funds, to these services.



- The location of neighborhood centers is largely a function of need. The City doesn't direct the placement of centers or have a plan for city-wide coverage like those, for example, which might guide decisions affecting fire station or library branch locations. Neither is there a mechanism by which centers are assigned service areas. But the City does exert influence over when and where new centers occur if only because few can get started without its financial help.

So, while the inspiration for new centers often comes from neighborhood residents, decisions about them are generally made collaboratively by neighborhood residents, non-profit operators and city officials.

- Most of Madison's neighborhood centers are located in areas with higher concentrations of low and moderate income households. While the characteristics of these neighborhoods are unique in many ways, they also share a number of common traits. For instance, their populations are more racially diverse than the City as a whole and their residents more likely to struggle with issues of poverty, unemployment or low educational attainment. Language or other cultural barriers are more common. Single-parent households are more prevalent and school age children more numerous. The housing stock is often sub standard and features higher density rental developments. These neighborhoods usually experience higher turnover rates among residents, greater transience among students and greater reliance on public transit.

In short, centers operate in neighborhoods where their help is most needed. These are parts of the city which are experiencing, or have at some point in their past, experienced economic or social distress. The ability to serve affected families or individuals in close proximity to their homes is of particular value.

- Neighborhood centers serve diverse populations. The demographic profile of people who use neighborhood centers is quite different from that of the city as a whole. Center users are both poorer and more racially diverse. Based on self reported information for 2013, centers served more than 90,000 people from 70,000 different households. Nearly 60% of those households were headed by women. More than 85% of center users identified themselves as low or moderate income (80% or less of the area median income level) and over 45% were very low income (30% or less of the area median income). With respect to racial make-up, the populations that use centers are also more diverse. People of color comprise just over 20% of the City's population but constitute nearly 45% of those who use neighborhood centers. Notably, the composition of center staffs is much more consistent with program participants. In 2013 about 35% of the people employed by neighborhood centers were non-white.



- The centers supported with City funds are very different from one another. Centers vary in many respects. Their operations reflect different levels of maturation and different service philosophies. They have available very different physical spaces, adhere to different schedules, offer different programs, have different service areas, and manage different sized budgets.

Some centers operate from cramped quarters in converted apartments or commercial buildings. Others enjoy much more spacious settings, in buildings converted from other uses or specially built for them. The quantity and quality of space has obvious impacts on a center's capacity to meet program needs, both in terms of the number of participants and the breadth of services it can support, and on its ability to generate fee revenues. Youth and family programming almost always takes precedence but centers also work hard to build community through activities and gatherings that bring together residents from different cultural or socio economic backgrounds.

- Neighborhood centers depend on financial support from multiple sources. The size of center budgets varies considerably (as will be discussed in more detail in the next section) but all struggle to find the resources needed to make ends meet. While City support has been generous and has lent some measure of financial stability to center operators, the proportion of total revenues derived from all government sources has declined. As a result, centers have been forced to turn increasingly to user fees and private fund raising. Some have proven better able than others to make that adjustment.
- The partnership between the City and neighborhood centers is mutually beneficial. In return for its investments, the City is assured reliable service from a group of providers strategically placed to help families most in need. Through their ongoing work within distressed neighborhoods, center staff is well positioned to understand the challenges facing these families and how best to address them. Their insight helps shape City policies and strategies which, in turn, are supported through City funding decisions. Meanwhile, the financial relationship between the City and centers affords the means by which service quality standards can be maintained.



CITY SUPPORTED NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

The growth in the number of neighborhood centers in Madison during the 1980s and 90s came largely in response to changing demographics and the spread of poverty to new areas of the city. One of the strategies that City officials and affected neighborhoods followed was to develop new centers where it was believed they could be helpful.

The City had first offered financial support to neighborhood centers in the late 1970s. It came in the form of operating assistance to a group of centers (South Madison, Neighborhood House, Wil-Mar, Atwood and Truax) operating in some of Madison's poorest neighborhoods. The aid was intended, at least in part, to help centers deal with a reduction in support from the United Way. The first instance of capital financing support occurred in 1979 when the City acted to help the South Madison Neighborhood Center rebuild after fire destroyed its Taft neighborhood facility.

These early efforts were modest and they were able to be financed from a new source of revenue – the federal Community Development Block Grant Program. However, as the scope of support to neighborhood centers steadily expanded to include planning, development and operations costs, it became necessary to commit city tax dollars as well.

In 2014, 14 neighborhood centers will receive nearly \$2.2 million in City support to help finance their operations. A 15th facility will be constructed in 2014, at City expense, and is expected to open early in 2015. It will require significant help to operate. The list of these centers includes:

- Bayview Community Center
- Boys and Girls Club - Allied
- Boys and Girls Club - Taft
- Bridge/Lake Point/Waunona Neighborhood Center
- Center for Resilient Cities
- East Madison Community Center
- Goodman Community Center
- Kennedy Heights Community Center
- Lussier Community Education Center
- Meadowood Neighborhood Center
- Neighborhood House Community Center
- Theresa Terrace Neighborhood Center (To open in 2015)
- Vera Court Neighborhood Center
- Wilmar Neighborhood Center
- Wisconsin Youth Company

See Attachment 1 for a map of the City of Madison showing the locations of these neighborhood centers. For a brief description and history of each center, see Attachment 2. Finally, Attachment 3 offers an overview of the unique characteristics of each center.

VARIATION IN NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS IN MADISON

On one level, neighborhood centers in Madison have a great deal in common with one another. They serve their neighborhoods from strategically located facilities. They work with residents to plan for and execute strategies that are designed to strengthen neighborhoods and improve the quality of life for residents. They pay particular attention to the needs of low-income families and children and others who are isolated by any number of physical, socio-economic or cultural barriers.

But for all their similarities, these centers are also very different in many important ways. One of the more obvious is the physical space within which they work. About half of neighborhood centers own their space; the rest lease. While a few occupy structures that were built expressly for their use, most are housed in spaces that were



built for other uses – apartments, schools, a factory – and converted to use as a neighborhood center. The size of neighborhood centers vary from less than 2,000 square feet (Theresa Terrace) to as much as 47,000 (Goodman Community Center). Five centers perform their work in buildings with no more than 5,000 square feet of space. Four others enjoy at least 20,000

square feet of usable space. Space differences go beyond just square footage. For example, several center facilities include gymnasiums or have available other large areas suitable to accommodate a broad range of different uses and users. It allows them to host neighborhood gatherings or offer programming space to other community groups. But it's a luxury most centers don't have. Some have computer labs accessible for residents, some have commercial kitchens. Computer labs and kitchens are both consistently mentioned as assets to populations that are looking for employment or small business start up opportunities.

Space considerations certainly factor in to two other key areas of difference – program mix and service area. Neighborhood centers offer a wide range of different programming. All provide services to youth, but not necessarily to all youth. For example, most centers offer after-school programs or summer youth activities for elementary and middle school age children. Class size and program content may vary

from one center to the next, some play areas might be better equipped than others, but they strive to address the needs of children in these age groups. The same can't be said with regard to older youth. Only one in four centers have after-school activities geared to high school students and just half offer summer programs. Likewise, for the very young, only 5 centers offer early childhood services.

Beyond youth, the variation in programming is even more pronounced. For example, only about half of the centers operate food pantries. Many lack the physical accommodations to do so. Only half provide activities for older adults and just five centers host senior nutrition programs. Fewer than half of the centers provide on-site adult employment training, though most of the others do try to connect people seeking those services to other organizations that provide them. Finally, just a third of the centers are currently involved with community gardens. Some of the variation in programming is likely a matter of different needs or priorities between neighborhoods. But space limitations and other capacity issues undoubtedly force centers to make difficult choices. The point is, the mix of programming varies considerably between centers.



There is also great variation between neighborhood centers with respect to their service areas. This is an obvious point but it masks the fact that service areas are difficult to define with any precision. As previously noted, new centers aren't assigned service areas but they do begin operations with a good sense of what will be their target areas. These tend to be more compact , geographically, not less. As centers mature, some might choose to expand their reach if they have the physical capacity and perceive that there is additional need. If not, the focus is likely to remain more localized. Most often, a smaller center will draw from a smaller geographic area.

Another variable in understanding service area is the impact of programming mix. In essence, the dimensions of service areas vary from one type of programming to another. Teens and adults are generally more mobile than young children so programs targeting them are more likely to draw participants from a larger area. It's reasonable to assume, therefore, that the more varied the mix of programming a particular center offers, the more likely it is to have a larger service area.

The City currently asks centers to compile and report annual service data. That includes information describing the number of program hours provided at the center, whether by center staff or a third party provider, and a count of the number of unduplicated persons that used the center over the course of the year.

The raw numbers paint a picture showing a wide range of facility use. In 2013, for example, the total number of program hours ranged from 1,250 to 28,000. The average number of hours was 6,800. Programming provided by outside groups accounted for 3,250 of those hours, on average, and ranged from 294 to 8,150. In terms of the number of people served, the numbers showed even greater variation, ranging from a low of 719 to a high of 36,416.

While this is interesting information, it should be used carefully. It is difficult to draw useful conclusions from the data, in large part, because there is such wide variation in how centers collect and report it. It is also clear that centers face challenges in collecting participant data. For example, not all services provided by centers are enrolled services. Participants don't always identify themselves by address at the point of service, or volunteer demographic or other descriptive information that might prove useful. What's more, some residents utilize multiple services offered at a center or frequent more than one center. Absent more sophisticated, and expensive, systems to better track the full range of circumstances, participant counts might be useful indicators of facility use but they are not reliable counts of unduplicated participants. For these reasons, program hours are probably more reliable measures than service numbers.

The absence of clear and consistent data is an obstacle in analyzing policy issues affecting neighborhood centers and the City's system of financial support. It is a topic worthy of further attention.

Part II: FUNDING OF NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

OVERVIEW OF CENTER BUDGETS

Regardless of their size, Madison’s neighborhood centers are complex operations. Collectively, the 14 centers receiving City financial support in 2014 (not including Theresa Terrace) had budgets totaling almost \$14 million. Individual center budgets ranged from \$230,000 to \$4.7 million, an indication of the vast differences that exist between their operations. The average annual budget fell just short of \$1 million.

The largest single source of funding for neighborhood center budgets is money raised through private fund raising. As a group, centers raised nearly 60% of their revenues from private donors. That’s three times as much as the next highest source but it likely obscures the fact that some centers are much better able to secure private donations than others. The portion of revenues derived from the City of Madison (17%) is nearly as much as centers get from all other government sources combined (18%). While federal and state sources have eroded in particular, some centers have actually been able to attract more from them by becoming more effective at securing competitive grants. One other source upon which centers are being forced to turn to at a growing rate is user fees. User fees currently account for 7.5% of total revenues. Chart 1, below, shows the breakout of center revenues for 2014 by source.




Chart 1

In terms of where the dollars go, center expenditures are concentrated in three areas – personnel, operations and space. Nearly 60% of center budgets (over \$8.3 million in all) went toward personnel costs in 2014. That figure doesn't reflect the substantial contribution that volunteers make to center operations. It is estimated that volunteers log over 40,000 hours of their time each year in support of neighborhood centers - a contribution valued at more than \$500,000.

The next largest draw on budgets goes for center operations, including such things as program supplies, transportation, food, printing, etc. It consumes over 20% of center budgets (\$2.9 million). Space costs, including maintenance and utilities, account for 14% of spending (\$2 million). Chart 2 shows the breakdown of spending for 2014.




Chart 2

CITY FUNDING FOR NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

In 2014, the City of Madison provided nearly \$2.2 million in financial support to the fourteen neighborhood centers previously identified. Most of that money (nearly 85%) came from property tax dollars. Federal CDBG funds supplied most of the rest. A small annual allocation made by a private donor to Vera Court Neighborhood Center rounds out the total. The City's investment of \$1.8 million in 2014, though substantial, represented less than 1% of its operating budget. Chart 3 shows the sources of funding that make up City contributions to neighborhood centers.

**TOTAL 2014 CDD FUNDING TO NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS
BY CDD SOURCE**




Chart 3

The financial support the City provides to neighborhood centers comes in three distinct categories.

- **Capital financing** is often provided to help cover initial costs associated with starting a new center. Typical expenses include property acquisition, new construction, renovation or lease payments. Financing is also available to help with costs incurred to expand or renovate existing center space.
- **Center support** is intended to cover a portion of the costs deemed necessary to keep centers open and available for use by residents and other service organizations. Center support helps pay for such things as administrative salaries, maintenance and janitorial expenses and utilities. These are often costs that other funders or private donors are reluctant to cover. Seventy percent of the dollars used by the City for center support comes from city tax payers. The rest comes from CDBG Program funds.
- **Program support** is offered to help centers pay for programming that is provided within their facilities. Program support funds are made available for center programming that is responsive to identified City goals and objectives. Program support is funded entirely from city property tax revenues.

Capital Financing

The City's willingness to make capital investments in neighborhood centers has been a key piece of its partnership starting with the decision to help rebuild the South Madison Neighborhood Center following a fire in 1979. Since then, the City has invested capital funds in nearly all of the centers it currently supports. In some cases the City has financed capital costs directly while in others it has extended long-term deferred loans to center operators. The following is a sample of the types of projects that have received capital support:

- Goodman Community Center was awarded \$250,000 to help acquire a new building,
- Lussier Community Education Center received \$600,000 to help finance a new facility,
- Kennedy Heights Community Center got \$40,000 to help convert an apartment to use as a center and an additional \$70,000 for its subsequent expansion,
- Meadowood Neighborhood Center is currently undergoing a million dollar City-financed renovation and expansion, and
- Theresa Terrace will be built, at an estimated cost in excess of \$700,000, entirely at City expense.

It is very difficult to plan and budget for these projects. Each one is unique with cost implications hinging upon such factors as how large a center will be, where it will be located, whether suitable property is available and at what cost and whether the project will entail renovation or new construction, etc. But other factors also come into play such as a project's ability to attract funds from other sources or the perceived need or urgency within a specific neighborhood.

The amount of assistance the City can offer is also quite variable. It's mostly a matter of what funds are available. Initially, the City's support for neighborhood centers was financed almost entirely with money made available through the CDBG Program. That sufficed during a time when the number of centers was small and capital projects infrequent. However, the needs of centers quickly outpaced the CDBG program's capacity to the point where it now accounts for less than 15% of the money the City invests in centers. CDBG funds no longer support capital spending.

As a result, capital projects for neighborhood centers must compete with all the City's other borrowing needs, an increasingly tall order in an era of tight budgets. It is particularly challenging for new center projects, which are especially dependent on City support. For this reason, the City exerts considerable influence over where and when new centers are added. Those decisions must strike a balance between the desire for new centers and the need to maintain those that already exist. They must also be mindful of the fact that once new centers are added, most of them will require long term support from the City to sustain their operations.

Center Support and Program Support

Whereas capital financing is a one-time occurrence, money provided for program support and center support is recurring. The level of ongoing support that Madison offers to neighborhood centers is what distinguishes it from most other communities around the country. In Madison, 85% of the money used to assist centers comes from city taxpayers. Very few other municipalities commit any local tax dollars.

The nearly \$2.2 million that was awarded to 14 centers in 2014 was divided almost equally between center support and program support. Both types of assistance are allocated through a competitive process conducted every two years by the City's Community Development Division. In that process, the City identifies its community service goals and objectives and invites service providers, including neighborhood centers to submit proposals that respond to them.

The outcomes of this funding process demonstrate just how closely aligned the work of neighborhood centers is with the City's goals and objectives. Awards to the centers account for about 40% of all dollars allocated to support human service related activities. Eighty percent of that money (\$865,000 out of \$1,075,000) supports programming that is designed to meet the needs of children and families. Fourteen percent (\$155,000) supports efforts tied to adult workforce development. The rest is used to serve older adults, to support culturally specific programming and to improve access to community services for persons with language or other barriers. Chart 4 shows how center funding is used.

TOTAL 2014 CDD CENTER SUPPORT FUNDING




Chart 4

The amount of program support that is awarded to individual centers depends on a number of factors. Chief among them are the type of programming for which funds are sought and the number of people a center expects to serve. As a whole, centers fare well because their focus on children and families closely matches City priorities.

For individual centers, the amounts that they are awarded vary dramatically. In 2014, for example, the amount of program support awarded to centers ranged from just \$5,000 to \$250,000. Much of the variation is attributable to the number of participants served by center programs. A second explanation for why some centers receive more program support is because they offer different types or levels of programs, or they seek support for a larger number of programs. A third reason stems from the fact that some centers simply need, and request, less assistance for programs. Take the case of the Meadowood Center. Meadowood received only \$5,000 in program support in 2014 largely because the Madison School Community Recreation program supplied most of the funds needed to support its work.

The funding process used to allocate program support is a somewhat static one. That is, so long as centers meet performance standards and demonstrate continued need for their programs, they can be reasonably confident of continued program support from the City. The difficulty is that, without an influx of new money, this approach leaves little room to support new or expanded programming. That places added pressure on center budgets, particularly in neighborhoods experiencing growing needs. The current approach to center support is quite different from program support. Like program support, center support is allocated through a Community Development administered funding process. In fact, it's the same process. As with program support, the allocation process yields dramatically different outcomes from one center to the next. In 2014, one center (Bayview) asked for and received no center support while two centers (Taft and WilMar) were awarded at least \$150,000. It is more difficult to explain the differences in center support than it is for program support.



The goal of center support is to offset certain costs, for example, those related to space or core staffing, that are deemed essential to keeping centers open and functioning. It does not support costs associated with specific types of programming. That's what program support is for. It stands to reason, then, that center support allocations would be largely unaffected by the types of programming that centers offer. Other than allowing for differences in center size (space costs), one might expect relatively little variability in the amounts centers receive for center support. But that isn't the case.

The current situation involving center support stems from changes that have occurred with respect to how the City has supported neighborhood centers. For years, the City's

support for centers flowed through two city agencies, each with a somewhat different objective. The CDBG Office offered support to develop and maintain center facilities in low-income neighborhoods. The Office of Community Services, meanwhile, focused on promoting high quality programming for low-income persons close to where they live.

In the late 1990s, an attempt was made to coordinate these efforts through a “core/facility use” payment model. The idea was to provide “core” support to centers in a way that would reduce or remove the need for them to seek program support. The model was only partially implemented. It was applied to a few centers and then it was abandoned. The result is the current arrangement which reflects no single methodology for making allocation decisions. It offers no basis upon which to adjust payments from year to year and, more importantly, no basis upon which to establish center support payments for new centers as they emerge.

FRAMEWORKS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER FUNDING



As discussed above, it is easier to explain and justify the disparity in the levels of program support than it is for center support. Program support reflects City goals and priorities, the number of program participants that centers serve and, to some degree, their budget needs. The process by which the City allocates program support offers centers a fair amount of stability and predictability. It also offers the means by which centers can ask for additional support to meet new or growing needs, even if resource limitations hamper the City’s ability to respond.

The situation with center support is different. Its purpose – to help centers keep their doors open – though important, is a bit more ambiguous. More importantly, the link between that goal and center support is missing.

Roughly half of the annual support the City provides to neighborhood centers is made through center support. Given that commitment, it makes sense to think about how allocation decisions for center support might be improved.

There are any number of ways in which center support dollars could be allocated. The following discussion presents a couple of approaches that might be considered. This is mostly a conceptual discussion, intended to offer some insight into how different approaches might be structured and stimulate further discussion, rather than offer final recommendations.


It is important to acknowledge at the outset that, no matter the method of allocation, center support is an important piece of the funding equation for most neighborhood

centers. They are already strapped for cash. Thus, should any new approach to allocating center support be devised, it should be implemented in a manner that helps mitigate significant adverse impacts on individual centers and the people they serve.

Equal Allocation Model

In 2014, the City distributed \$1,135,000 in center support to 13 neighborhood centers. Bayview did not receive center support funds. The simplest approach to allocating center support would be to simply divide the available funds equally among the centers. If funding levels went up, or down, in the future the impact would be shared equally. Offering equal allotments to achieve a common goal – keeping centers open – seems like a fair approach. It’s easy to understand and would allow centers to know what they could expect each year.

To illustrate its impact, if the \$1,135,000 that was distributed in 2014 was divided equally, it would be sufficient to offer each center about \$81,000. Adding Theresa Terrace to the mix would reduce the amount by \$5,500. An equal allocation would cause a significant redistribution of funds among the centers. Nine of the 14 would realize increases, including Bayview, which currently receives no center support. Five of them would see increases of 50% or more. On the other hand, the five remaining centers would experience reductions in their allocations. In at least two cases, Taft and WilMar, those cutbacks would be severe – about half of current amounts. The chart below shows the impacts of an equal allocation model for each center.



Center Support Allocations Based on Equal Allocation Model

Of course, an equal allocation model could be structured in a way that would not harm any center. It would require providing about \$160,000 in center support, the highest

amount currently paid, at a total added cost of \$1.25 million. Providing \$110,000 to each center would protect all but two against losses. That would require about \$500,000 more than current funding levels. (In both cases, Theresa Terrace is included in the calculations.)

These estimates make clear that an equal distribution of center support funds could prove very disruptive to some centers unless new money could be found to insulate them from funding reductions. They also show that additional funding would have to be provided to prevent new centers from diluting existing center support amounts.

The larger issue with this approach, however, is that it ignores important differences between centers, differences which in some cases have an impact on the ability to keep their facilities open and accessible. So while payments might be equal, they would probably not be equitable.

Neighborhood Center Categorization Model

It makes sense to try to craft a center support model that attempts to account for some of the differences between the centers. Centers might be grouped with other comparable centers based on the relative size of their facilities, for example, or their service area, or the length of time they have been operating. Center support for one group might differ from that of another, but within each group, all centers would be treated the same.

In crafting center groupings, it would be important to choose criteria that reflect meaningful differences between centers and that are measurable. Characteristics that might be considered in grouping centers include such things as facility size, service area, participant totals, fund raising capacity or number of years in operation.

Here is one very simple example of center categorization. It places centers into one of three categories – “Small”, “Medium” or “Large”. A different level of center support would be established for each category.



Small Centers

A Small Center would be one that occupies not more than 5,000 square feet of space. Its attention would be focused on residents living in a small geographic area, perhaps a specific housing complex. Small centers might receive financial contributions from one or more private owners of properties that house center users. These centers would be limited, because of space, with respect to the range of services they can offer. Currently, the Bayview and Kennedy Heights centers might fit this description.

Medium Centers

Medium centers would operate out of slightly larger facilities, perhaps 5,000 to 10,000 square feet. They would primarily serve residents in clearly identified neighborhoods,

but might also offer programming that could attract participants from beyond. Though larger than the first category, these centers are still limited in physical size and capacity. Existing centers that might fit this category would include Bridge Lake Point Waunona, Boys & Girls Club – Allied, Boys & Girls Club – Taft, the Center for Resilient Cities, East Madison Community Center, Lussier Community Education Center, Meadowood Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood House, Vera Court Community Center, WilMar Neighborhood Center and Wisconsin Youth & Family Center.

Large Centers

Large centers would possess both the physical space to accommodate a higher volume of use and the staff resources needed to support a broader range of programming. Large centers would also demonstrate a general willingness to open the facility for use by outside service organizations and members of the community. Though these centers would place a first priority on service to residents within their neighborhoods, some of their programming would draw participants from a larger, even city-wide, area. For these reasons, larger centers could be expected to have access to a broader base of financial support. The Goodman Community Center would be the only current neighborhood center that would fall into this category.

There is some conceptual appeal to an approach that tries to account for differences between centers in a simple way. But it would be no easy task to establish group parameters that would fairly and accurately capture the circumstances of each center.



And creating the groupings would be only the first step. The bigger challenge would lie in determining how that would impact the allocation of center support. That isn't at all clear. For example, one might argue that smaller centers should receive less center support because they have lower costs. However, it could also be argued that these centers are less able to generate user fees or other donations and, thus, need more center support.

The grouping of like centers as the basis for center support would be an improvement over the current approach. In the end, it is little more than a variation of the equal allocation approach, with some attempt to vary outcomes based on center differences. It would require additional discussion regarding how the groups would be defined and how dollars would be allocated.

Cost Based Allocation Model

Center support is intended to help neighborhood centers cover some of the expenses needed to maintain facility operations. The question of which expenses to recognize is

open to discussion but they most likely would include those tied to space costs, facility maintenance and a set of core staffing functions.

Given the vast differences between centers, it is reasonable to expect there to be some variation in these types of costs, not just in terms of how much is spent, but also how those expenses are accounted for. For instance, some centers employ maintenance staff while others contract out the service. Some allowance needs to be made for those kinds of differences. Ultimately though, the total of these costs would drive the allocation of center support, likely as a fixed percentage of those costs.

This model assumes that center support amounts would be calculated for each center based on its own cost experience for a specified set of expenses. Each would receive the same fixed percentage of those costs, the rate to be determined based on available funding.


But if all centers aren't the same, perhaps center support shouldn't be allocated as though they are. It is possible to make adjustments to accommodate some of their differences. One option is to establish different cost standards for different groups of



centers – say smaller centers and larger centers. Expense data in each area would be collected for small centers, and using it, a median or average cost could be calculated and used as the basis for allocation decisions. The same process would be followed for larger centers. This approach might yield a better picture of cost experiences across all the centers. Moreover, using average or median costs to allocate center support might encourage individual centers to keep their costs in line with their peers.

In an exercise to illustrate how a cost-based approach might work, Community Development staff constructed one such model using 2012 budget data from 13 neighborhood centers. The analysis did not include the Center for Resilient Cities or Theresa Terrace. The following chart shows how center support was allocated in 2012.

2012 CITY FUNDING OF CENTER SUPPORT ACTUAL ALLOCATIONS




In the model, centers were divided into two groups. One group, labeled “focused” centers, was comprised of seven centers that occupy not more than 6,000 square feet of space. Their service areas are generally defined by neighborhood boundaries. The focused group included: Bayview, Boys & Girls Club – Taft, Bridge Lake Point Waunona, Kennedy Heights, Meadowood Neighborhood Center, Vera Court Community Center, and Wisconsin Youth & Family Center.

The second group, “regional” centers, included the six larger centers whose services areas are generally understood to extend beyond their own neighborhoods. The regional centers included Boys & Girls Club – Allied, East Madison Community Center, Goodman Community Center, Lussier Community Education Center, Neighborhood House, and WilMar Neighborhood Center.

Each center supplied 2012 budget data for facility space, expenses connected with functions that are typically performed by an executive director and an administrative assistant, and non-program related operations. Using this information, staff compiled a median cost index for each of the two groups which reflected the sum of the costs for all of these expenses. For the focused centers that total came to \$201,000. For regional centers, the total was about 20% higher - \$240,000.

The model then calculated center support for each center as an amount equal to 40% of the respective median cost for each group. Thus, each center within the “focused” group was allocated \$80,380 and each center within the “regional” group \$95,880. The following chart shows how center support would be allocated under this model.

2012 CITY FUNDING OF CENTER SUPPORT COST-BASED INDEX - CITY SHARE = 40%



As the chart makes clear, if this model was used to allocate center support, it would produce very different results than the current system. Eight of the thirteen centers would receive more center support under this model than they do currently. Five would see reductions. Interestingly, the impacts aren't influenced solely by which category a center is assigned to. For instance, within the set of focused group centers, four centers would experience increases but three would be cut. And among regional centers, four would see increases while two would be cut.

Of course, if center support was allocated using this model, and the total amount of money to be allocated remained the same, the result would be a significant redistribution of dollars between the centers. In that scenario, the dollars to fund the increases for centers slated to receive more would be drawn from those the model determines should receive less. In some cases, the consequences could be severe.

The five centers for whom center support would decline would see reductions totaling nearly \$225,000. The Boys and Girls Club center at Taft would be asked to absorb an \$82,000 reduction, more than half of its current allocation. The allocation to Wil Mar would decline by \$55,000, a drop of 35%. Bridge Lake Point Waunona (30%) and Vera Court (26%) and the Boys and Girls Club at Allied (19%) would all be significantly affected. Strangely enough, the largest increase (\$80,000) would accrue to Bayview, a center that does not currently request any center support.

The way to protect centers from funding cuts is to increase the total outlay for center support. In the scenario outlined above, it would cost an additional \$325,000 to set allocations at the proscribed amounts without inflicting funding reductions on any center. Rather than take funds away from the five centers slated for reductions, those funds could be transferred for use to support their programming efforts. That could be a permanent adjustment or part of a strategy to phase in a new payment structure over a specified period of time.

There is one point that should be stressed in this discussion. It may be tempting to conclude that the centers for whom center support would increase are somehow undercompensated under the current allocation process. Or that those slated for reductions currently receive too much center support. But neither of those claims is valid. Because the current allocation system makes no attempt to link how much centers receive in center support to how much they spend in these areas, it would be both misleading and unfair to compare its outcomes with one that does.

[Additional Models and Strategies for Transition Planning](#)

There are other issues that ought to be considered regarding how the City supports neighborhood centers. One suggestion that has been made is that center support and program support be combined and centers given more discretion over how funds get used. Centers would be relieved of the burdens of writing applications and could focus instead on serving neighborhoods. But it would still be necessary to devise a way to allocate funds and to develop safeguards to ensure that they were used to address City priorities.

Some have questioned whether City support, especially center support, should continue to be paid indefinitely to centers or be phased out over time. It might be argued that centers are most dependent on City support in their early years of operation. Over time, they should be able to enhance their capacity to attract other revenues and reduce their reliance on City support. That may be so but it is more likely that some centers will prove less able to raise sufficient revenues from other sources. A reduction in their City support may not be the most appropriate response.



Which leads to the broader question of whether, or how, the City might try to account for differences in financial need. Clearly, there is great disparity between centers in terms of their abilities to generate funds from other sources, whether from user fees, facility use charges, grant writing, or corporate and other private donations. In 2014, for example, reported revenues raised from user fees ranged from \$0 to nearly \$850,000. Fundraising totals ranged from \$70,000 to nearly \$1.8 million. To a great degree, these differences are attributable to factors over which centers have little control – their size, their location, the breadth of their programming. In the end, some neighborhood centers and the

populations they serve are simply more dependent upon City support than others. The question is how to account for that fact without discouraging, or penalizing, centers for their successes.

A good case can be made for reforming the way the City allocates more than \$1.1 million annually for center support. There is little justification for how that money is currently allocated and no method by which to calibrate center support for new centers. This section of the report has identified several options for how that might be done. They have been discussed only in general terms and any of them would require further work before they could be implemented.

It is difficult to contemplate changes to funding systems in the type of environment like that within which neighborhood centers currently operate. It costs money to run successful centers and dollars are increasingly harder to come by. The City's contributions, though less than 20% of the total, are an important part of the budget equation. At the same time, both residents and community leaders acknowledge that neighborhood centers play a critical role in helping to meet the needs that exist in troubled parts of Madison. They are particularly effective in serving low-income children and families, and in settings that are easily accessible. Should new approaches to financial support emerge, therefore, they should be pursued in a manner that is supportive of that work.



With these thoughts in mind, the following points should guide future decisions around issues affecting neighborhood centers:

- New neighborhood centers require significant investments of capital dollars. Unfortunately, because the costs of these projects can vary so much depending on their unique circumstances, it is very difficult to plan for them without knowing those circumstances.
- New neighborhood centers will also need ongoing support from the City in order to maintain their facilities and provide programming. The addition of new centers should not occur unless the capacity exists to provide needed operating support. In other words, the funding needs of new centers should not come at the expense of support for existing centers.
- Changes to City funding policies carry the potential of being disruptive, if not destabilizing. Every center operates within tight budgets. There is little point in implementing funding changes that would cause hardships for neighborhood centers and the populations they serve. Thus, the planning for any new funding approach should include steps to mitigate unwanted consequences.
- New funding approaches will inevitably favor some centers and disadvantage others. To the extent possible, redistributive impacts should be minimized through either the infusion of new resources or a phased in implementation.

- It would be useful to improve the data that is available around neighborhood centers. A lot of data is already provided, however, its usefulness is limited by the lack of consistency in its collection. There is value in being able to better understand and quantify the reach of neighborhood centers and the good work they perform. City and center staff should work to identify the information that is most relevant and standardize its collection.



Part III. FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

FACTORS AND CONDITIONS TO BE CONSIDERED

It is testimony to the success of neighborhood centers in Madison that as new areas of the city face problems of poverty and related socio-economic distress, residents and elected officials increasingly view new centers as part of a needed response. Neighborhood centers are not a panacea for all that ails the City but they have proven to be effective at helping to address human service needs. Yet, while few would question the value of investments that have already been made in neighborhood centers, the way forward is both difficult and expensive.



Successful neighborhood centers are the products of collaboration between residents and city officials. Typically, they begin with the emergence of symptoms of distress within a neighborhood. Together, residents and staff work to develop a shared vision for the area and a focused, sustainable plan to achieve it. In some cases, a neighborhood center may become a part of that plan.

The City may not always initiate conversations about new centers but is a key player because they almost always require its financial assistance. Thus, as calls for additional centers become more numerous, the absence of a measured and coherent City policy toward planning for new centers has become more and more apparent.

As strong as its support for neighborhood centers has been, city government does not and cannot own or operate them. That is the purview of non-profit agencies working in concert with neighborhood residents. Still, adding centers has potentially significant and enduring implications for City budgets. Most new centers require help with initial capital costs, and those costs vary greatly from one project to another. That makes it difficult to plan for them. Yet it is clear enough that the City cannot afford to build neighborhood centers everywhere they might be desired.

Madison's experience with neighborhood centers suggests that there are some conditions which, if present, are more likely to yield successful outcomes. These should be considered in conversations about planning for new centers.

1. Community Need

The obvious, but not so simple, starting point is determining a sense of need for a center. Though data often informs the discussion, this is, on some levels, a somewhat subjective assessment. Increased police contacts, higher incidences

of building code violations, vacant storefronts, rising truancy rates all can alert community leaders to deteriorating conditions.

In Madison, one of the City's strategies in responding to troubled neighborhoods has been to form neighborhood resource teams (NRTs). NRTs are comprised of City staff members who work together, and with neighborhood stakeholders, to improve and coordinate local government services and increase the City's knowledge of neighborhood issues and opportunities. NRT members note that neighborhood stakeholders frequently identify the lack of a center or other public space as a key impediment to addressing issues of concern.

At present, there are more than 100 city employees working as part of nine active NRTs in these neighborhoods or areas:

- Allied Drive
- Balsam/Russett
- Brentwood/Northport Corridor
- Darbo Worthington
- Hammersley/Theresa
- Leopold/Arbor Hills
- Owl Creek
- Park Edge/Park Ridge
- Southside

The neighborhoods to which NRTs have been assigned were selected based on a host of factors including high numbers of police calls, significant housing and building inspection issues, and unsatisfactory performances with respect to employment and academic achievement. (At one point, NRTs also served in the Bayview, Bridge Lake Point, Kennedy Heights and Wexford Ridge neighborhoods. Through their work, and the efforts of strong neighborhood centers, these NRTs have been disbanded.)



So, given the City's commitment via its NRTs, these neighborhoods would seem to warrant close scrutiny for neighborhood centers. In fact, five of the nine, Allied, Balsam/Russett, Hammersley/Theresa, Park Edge/Park Ridge and Southside already are served by centers, or soon will be.

There has been interest expressed by some in consulting other data in planning for new neighborhood centers. The challenge comes in finding reliable, objective data that can help describe and quantify neighborhood conditions.

One potential source is U.S. Census data. In 2013, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) used 2010 Census data for Dane County, as well as data from the 2007-12 American Community Survey, to try to identify certain risk indicators that could be viewed as barriers to opportunity. Its analysis focused on the prevalence of specific factors within census tracts, such as the incidence of poverty, unemployment or high concentrations of youth, which are often indicative of economic or social distress. If multiple risk indicators were found to be present in a census tract, that might be evidence of vulnerability and cause for concern. Those areas would be logical targets for further analysis and community input as well as efforts to learn about what services might already exist. The CARPC data will be discussed in more detail later in this section.



Another source of information that could prove useful in analyzing need within neighborhoods is data expected to be collected through the Madison Out of School Time (MOST) Initiative. Though still in its early stages, MOST promises to help identify which parts of the City have insufficient capacity to provide programming to school age children. That should help stimulate discussions about how community resources might best be mobilized to fill those gaps.

2. Community Support

A second critical ingredient is the active support from key neighborhood stakeholders – residents, school officials, service providers, businesses, faith-based organizations, elected officials, etc. A neighborhood center has the best chance for success if it is one element of a planned and thoughtful strategy to support and strengthen the community. If it is, a center is much more likely to be able to attract and sustain the kind of financial and volunteer support it will need to thrive.

3. Professional Capacity

A strong and professional organization is needed to operate a neighborhood center. It is crucial to have the support and involvement of engaged residents, volunteers and service organizations but they cannot fill the role of a qualified operator. Whether identified as plans for a center develop or selected at some later point, an operator must possess the skills necessary to engage residents, build relationships, provide or arrange for programming, manage resources and operate a complex organization.

4. Financial Capacity

A decision to create a neighborhood center is a substantial financial commitment. It should not be undertaken without a viable plan for support. The largest single outlay is the capital cost, and as previously explained, it is difficult to plan for. The City's 2014 5-year capital improvement plan anticipates spending \$1 million a year for neighborhood center projects. It does not specify where those projects might occur or even whether they will involve new centers. In any event, it's an amount that at best, might be sufficient to support one or two projects per year.

A new center will also need help with operations. The size of the operating budget will turn on the scope of the center itself but the smallest center budget in 2014 was nearly \$250,000. Theresa Terrace, a very small facility which is expected to offer limited programming initially and operate only during weekday hours, has a projected operating budget of \$130,000. The point is, a decision to add a center must anticipate the need for operating support. If not, new centers will only draw funds away from those that already exist.

The City's own fiscal limitations have to be a factor in decisions affecting the expansion of neighborhood centers. They should serve as motivation to explore opportunities for sharing community resources, including public school buildings, enhancing coordination with other funders and service providers, and attracting greater private support.

5. Opportunity

Any attempt to develop a plan for new neighborhood centers has to leave room for situations or opportunities that might arise unexpectedly and prove disruptive. For example, a center that leases space might be displaced by ownership changes or redevelopment plans. Conditions in a particular neighborhood might rapidly deteriorate. Or valued real estate might suddenly become available in a desirable location. Any of these events could alter the thinking about the timing or placement of new centers. A plan to guide center investments should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate them.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CARPC DATA

In the interest of prompting further thought around the placement of new neighborhood centers, the next section of this report turns to a discussion of the data compiled by the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC). Using 2010 Census data, and information gathered from the 2007-12 American Community Survey, CARPC identified demographic indicators that work to create barriers to economic

opportunity for people living in Dane County. The data was originally compiled in conjunction with CARPC's work in preparing its Dane County Fair Housing Equity Assessment.

CARPC's analysis focused on all 310 census block groups within Dane County. However, working with CARPC Senior Community Planner Steve Steinhoff, that data was able to be organized to allow, within the City of Madison, reasonably good analysis at the neighborhood level.

To identify barriers to opportunity, CARPC analyzed the prevalence of 10 socio economic characteristics, or indicators, which might make it more difficult to access economic,



educational or social opportunities. For each indicator, CARPC calculated a statistical threshold value, or “barrier threshold” above which would indicate cause for concern. For example, a block group for which the percentage of persons below the federal income

poverty level exceeded 27.6% was deemed to exhibit high risk based on that indicator. The list of characteristics for which barrier thresholds were established, and their values, is provided:

- Segregation – the % of non white persons living in the block group (41.5%)
- Poverty – the % of people living below the federal poverty level (27.9%)
- Language Barriers – the number of persons with limited English proficiency (6.6%)
- Mobility Limitations – the % of households with no vehicle (18.2%)
- Single Parent Families – the % of single parent households (29.4%)
- Housing Cost Burden – the % of households paying more than 50% of their income toward rent (38.2%)
- Education Barriers – the % of adults with less than a high school education (12.9%)
- Youth Concentrations – the % of children under age 18 (26.7%)
- Unemployment – the % of adults who are unemployed (10.9%)
- Public Assistance – the % of families receiving Food Share (20.8%)

In using these risk indicators to assess neighborhoods in Madison, attention was given both to census blocks that exceeded the barrier thresholds for each characteristic and to those that were within 10% of those thresholds. Effectively, this analysis draws attention to block groups that are near or above the barrier thresholds.

The CARPC data is a good starting point in an effort to assess the relative levels of need or distress in Madison neighborhoods. It is uniform, readily accessible data that is both current and able to be tracked over time. And the data points are certainly relevant to the discussion.

However, the use of CARPC data also poses some challenges. For one, there is not perfect alignment between census tract block groups and neighborhood boundaries. In some cases, a small neighborhood like Theresa Terrace makes up only a fraction of a block group. Or, a larger neighborhood might spread across multiple block groups. In the case of the Leopold, Allied and Rimrock/Moorland neighborhoods, they even transcend municipal boundaries. It is important to understand, therefore, that the statistical information used in this analysis, and the risk factors they help identify, are only approximations of the circumstances that exist in the identified neighborhoods.



A second complication with this data is the “contamination” caused by its inclusion of university students. Their presence skews the results around poverty city wide, for example, painting a picture for some block groups that isn’t truly descriptive. For that reason, block groups in which university students represent the majority of the population were not included in this analysis.

Finally, some of the data points from both the Census and ACS contain high margins of error. Those situations are noted where they arise and caution is offered about the need for closer examination. An example might be a block group that shows both a high poverty rate and very low unemployment.

The CARPC data includes 158 Census tract block groups that are in the City of Madison. Nineteen of these exhibited at least four risk indicators that exceeded barrier thresholds. Twelve of the nineteen block groups with four or more high risk indicators are located in areas of the city already served by neighborhood centers. Therefore, the neighborhoods to be discussed below include three that contain census blocks with multiple high risk indicators (Darbo Worthington, Leopold and Owl Creek/Liberty Place). One additional neighborhood (Brentwood) is also discussed. Brentwood does not exhibit high risk indicators per the CARPC analysis, however it is the only other neighborhood that is currently the focus of an NRT team but not served by an existing center.

Attachment 4 provides CARPC summary data for the four neighborhoods identified above, as well as for other neighborhoods that either exhibited four or more high risk indicators but are already served by centers, or for which an NRT team is in place.

HIGH NEED AREAS WITHOUT NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

Darbo Worthington

The Darbo Worthington neighborhood is located on the City's near northeast side, east of East Washington Avenue and south of Commercial Avenue. The State Department of Corrections has a large office complex to the north, and the Salvation Army operates a community center in the midst of the neighborhood. Along East Washington, there are three commercial lots, all of which have been vacated in recent years. Worthington Park is central to the neighborhood, offering a recently refurbished basketball court, a small playground and a wooded area. The housing stock in the area includes 120 units of low income rental housing owned by Meridian Homes, public housing owned by the City's Community Development Authority and some modestly priced single family homes.



Darbo Worthington has long struggled with issues of concentrated poverty, particularly affecting children and youth. Additionally, Darbo has experienced ongoing difficulties with youth gang activity, including violence, and high youth and adult unemployment.

The rental housing has experienced high rates of tenant turnover, complicating resident and school engagement efforts. The neighborhood is not proximate to the schools that serve its families. It has lacked an institutional presence that could meet the needs of families and focus on efforts to stabilize the neighborhood. The Salvation Army has made efforts to fill that role, so far, with somewhat mixed results. Its work has been plagued by questions of access to residents, an issue the group continues to try to address. The agency does not perceive its primary mission to be that of specifically serving the neighborhood or operating a neighborhood center.

In a recent community discussion, Darbo residents identified numerous goals for the neighborhood over the next 2-3 years. They included:

- Progress in employment (more living wage jobs and employment support, including training and apprenticeships)
- A neighborhood grocery store
- Improved and expanded programming in Worthington Park
- More opportunities for outdoor activities, greater access to the Salvation Army facility and women's fitness groups
- Redevelopment of properties along East Washington Avenue
- Community and market gardens.

The Darbo NRT has suggested the City identify capital funds to purchase the Salvation Army property for use as a community center and a base for other provider groups. It is a view shared by the Mayor. The value of that property, which includes more than the

just the facility, has been appraised in excess of \$5 million. It could become available if the Salvation Army proceeds with consolidation plans currently under consideration but that is not certain.

Darbo Worthington is located within Census tract block 20.00 (1). This block extends beyond the neighborhood boundaries including several blocks north into the Town of Blooming Grove. The Census block group exceeds the high risk thresholds in the following categories:

- Segregation
- Poverty
- Mobility Limitations
- Single Parent Families
- Education Barriers
- Youth Concentrations
- Unemployment
- Public Assistance

In addition, it is within 10% of the high risk threshold with respect to housing cost burden.

The Darbo Worthington neighborhood is currently served by several providers. The Salvation Army offers some programming for children and youth, and provides limited accommodations for a Dane County Joining Forces for Families worker. Mentoring Positives is another outreach and service provider that works with neighborhood youth. The group operates out of a CDA –owned apartment but enjoys access to The Salvation Army facility, including its gymnasium.

The Goodman Community Center, located a half mile away, has also done outreach and engagement in this neighborhood for years. It provides services to neighborhood children and youth and recently helped develop the Women of Worthington group.

The Hawthorne library branch is located less than a half mile away. It serves Darbo Worthington residents and reports very high usage of computers for employment searches.

Finally, Meridian management staff is an active participant in the Darbo NRT and have been supportive of efforts to engage neighborhood residents and reduce crime in the area.

Leopold

The Leopold neighborhood is a large, densely populated area on the southwest side of Madison. Portions of the neighborhood are in the City of Madison, portions lie in Fitchburg and portions in the Town of Madison.

The neighborhood includes Aldo Leopold Park, Arbor Hills Park, the Nine Springs Golf Course, a large area of open space, and the Cannonball Bike Bath. Aldo Leopold Park, located behind the school, includes a basketball court, play structures, a sledding hill and soccer field which are used occasionally for unstructured activities, and a community garden. Arbor Hills Park includes a basketball court, a park shelter, playground and sledding hill.

The area contains several commercial spaces, including along Fish Hatchery Road, which serve the neighborhood and offer some employment opportunities. Children in the area attend the Madison Metropolitan School District. The largest elementary school in the district, Leopold Elementary, is located in the neighborhood. Over 600 students are enrolled and approximately 70% of them qualify for free and reduced lunch. Available data indicate that about 90% of the housing in the area is rental, ranging from 2-4 units to as many as 48 or more.



Residents have expressed concerns about safety due to occasional drug activity, the presence of large groups of unsupervised kids, and areas that are overgrown with brush or not visible by neighbors. This area has limited access to affordable and nutritious food and is considered a food desert by the USDA. Metro Transit service is limited to mornings and evenings, with no service on weekends or holidays.

This area was the focus of a recent comprehensive neighborhood planning effort, conducted as a joint project between the City of Madison, City of Fitchburg, Town of Madison, the Arbor Hills and Leopold Neighborhood Associations, and the Madison Metropolitan School District. The Madison Common Council adopted the plan in 2013. Among its chief recommendations were the establishment of a neighborhood gathering place to facilitate community engagement, the provision of community and economic empowerment services, and increased programming for neighborhood children and youth. In subsequent neighborhood discussions, residents have expressed a desire for:

- A community center
- Youth afterschool and summer programming
- More community activities such as festivals and community nights
- More family support opportunities
- Improved evening access to computers
- A splash park/pool
- A library branch.

The Leopold NRT has recommended that the area be considered for a neighborhood center.

The Leopold neighborhood boundary includes three Census tract block groups. They are mostly, but not entirely, within the City of Madison. The analysis also extends to a fourth, adjacent block group. Though it lies in the City of Fitchburg, this area is included because of its impacts on Madison schools and the quality of life in the Leopold neighborhood. The Census tract block groups exceed the risk thresholds as follows:

- Segregation – 2 of the 4 block groups exceed the risk threshold, two more are within 10% of the threshold
- Language Barriers – 2 of 4 block groups exceed the risk threshold
- Single Parent Families - 1 of the 4 block groups exceed the threshold, another is within 10% of the threshold
- Housing Cost Burden- One block group is within 10% of the threshold
- Education Barriers – 1 of the 4 block groups exceeds the threshold, another is within 10% of the threshold
- Youth Concentration – 2 of the 4 block groups exceed the threshold
- Unemployment – 2 of the 4 block groups exceed the threshold
- Public Assistance – 2 of the 4 block groups exceeds the threshold, another is within 10% of the threshold

Put another way:

- One block group exceeds the City’s threshold on 6 characteristics,
- One block group exceeds the City’s threshold on 5 of the characteristics,
- One block group exceeds the City’s threshold on 1 of the characteristics, and
- One block group exceeds the City’s threshold on 0 of the characteristics.

The CARPC data reveals a concentration of high need block groups and an area that is unique in terms of its expansiveness.

The nearest neighborhood centers (The Allied and Taft Boys and Girls Club centers) are more than 2.5 miles away. The nearest library is the Fitchburg Library, which is also about 2.5 miles from the neighborhood. There is a Joining Forces for Families site in the Leopold neighborhood, however, the agency’s major service hub for southwest Madison is about 2 miles away in the Villager Mall.



Leopold Elementary school is a significant neighborhood asset. The school has adopted an Open School House model in which, one night per week, residents are allowed to use the gym, library and

computer lab. Residents are also invited to attend English as a Second Language classes and participate in computer training and other structured activities. There is a strong desire to expand this opportunity, a prospect that would contribute greatly to meeting neighborhood needs. The school also hosts Madison School and Community Recreation activities during the summer. The Leopold School playground is used in the evenings and on weekends for soccer leagues and informal play. In addition, Group Health Cooperative has adopted Leopold Elementary school and provides free health care to students in need.

The neighborhood includes two active neighborhood associations. The Leopold Area Resource Coalition (LARC) is a large group of service providers, property managers, faith-based organizations and other community partners that come together to address community needs. The effort includes more than 40 participants and has been active for over two decades.

Owl Creek and Liberty Place

The Owl Creek and Liberty Place neighborhood is a small and isolated area on Madison's southeast side. It is south of the Beltline and east of Hwy 51. The neighborhood is surrounded on three sides by the City of McFarland.

The area was originally designed to support owner occupied housing – primarily single family houses with a number of larger duplexes built for occupancy by family homeowners. The downturn in the housing market interrupted development plans, leaving pockets of unfinished projects, dirt piles and overgrown, empty lots, primarily on the northern end of the neighborhood. The stall in the housing market also kept duplex units from selling. In some cases, that led to their conversion to rental units. Depressed property values also attracted purchases by Habitat for Humanity. A 1-2 block area is occupied by single family homes built with help from Habitat.

Veteran's Park provides a large open space but is not easily accessible for children and youth. There is a smaller park in the neighborhood that is somewhat wooded and mostly shielded from view from the street. As a result, families are reluctant to allow children to use it.

One of the most notable things about this neighborhood is its isolation. There are no schools in the area, no library, little if any commercial retail development and really nothing in the way of public spaces. There is little to occupy children and youth after school or on weekends. Not surprisingly, that has contributed to some problems and tension with unsupervised youth. The neighborhood's isolation has been further compounded by a lack of public transportation, which makes it more difficult for youth to participate in extra-curricular activities or secure employment. In 2013, a group of neighborhood youth led a



successful effort to convince the City to provide bus service to the area. Service started in the fall and has been heavily used.

In recent community discussions, neighborhood residents have identified a variety of issues they would like to see addressed. They include:

- Expansion of bus service to include extended hours and routes that will connect youth to activities
- A community center or other public space with access to computers and recreational activities
- Teen employment
- A response to unsupervised youth congregating on the streets and in parks
- Improved street plowing
- Speed bumps to control traffic speeds
- Improve neighborhood aesthetics by tending to vacant and overgrown lots



The Owl Creek NRT offered input for the 2015 Capital Budget asking that the City consider developing a community or resource center for Owl Creek. Additionally, the NRT supports efforts by the City to acquire property for a more centrally located neighborhood park. It is believed that a better situated park could function as a gathering space for residents and provide a basketball court, playground area and other amenities.

Owl Creek and Liberty Place fall within Census tract block 105.1 (2). The block group exceeds the high risk thresholds in the following categories:

- Language Barriers
- Youth Concentrations
- Unemployment

In addition, it is within 10% of the high risk threshold with respect to housing cost burden.

Although data indicates that low income residents in this neighborhood carry a high housing cost burden relative to their income, they have indicated in past surveys a high level of satisfaction with their housing situation. That may relate to the fact that it is so difficult to find large, family-sized bedrooms, such as those available in the Owl Creek duplexes that are affordable.

The Bridge Lake Point Waunona neighborhood center is approximately 3.5 miles from the Owl Creek neighborhood. It is separated by Highway 51 which makes the center

difficult to access by foot or bike. In the past several years, the City has provided funds to BLW for use in serving Owl Creek youth. Transportation from the neighborhood has also been provided. Most of those served are of middle and high school age. Capacity limitations prevent the center from serving more than a handful of elementary school children. In 2013, Freedom Inc., a local non-profit, received City funds to support community organizing and engagement efforts in Owl Creek.

Brentwood

The Brentwood neighborhood is located on the City's north side, just south of Warner Park and west of North Sherman Avenue. Housing in the area consists of primarily single family homes with a concentration of multifamily unit buildings (2-8 units each) along the neighborhood's northern edge. There is no commercial development within the Brentwood neighborhood but there is nearby, across Sherman Avenue. It includes retail outlets, a grocery store and a library branch. Warner Park Community Recreation Center, a City owned and operated facility, is located less than a half mile away. It is separated from the neighborhood by a large expanse of Warner Park. There are two small community centers operating in the nearby Northport Packers area but they serve only residents of the housing complexes in which they are located.

One of the primary concerns in the Brentwood neighborhood is the lack of safe, public spaces and structured activities, especially for neighborhood youth. This contributes to safety concerns among residents and heightened sensitivities to crime and violence there.

In community discussions, neighborhood residents have identified the following concerns they wish to see addressed:

- Expansion of youth activities, including youth leadership development, and weekend programming, with a particular emphasis on middle and high school aged boys
- Youth and adult life skills programming
- Employment training programs and better communication about employment opportunities
- Improved recreational opportunities including lighted basketball courts, a pool/splash pad and organized sports leagues
- Community engagement activities, like block parties, that might bring residents together



The Brentwood neighborhood comprises only a portion of Census tract block group 22.00 (3), which encompass a 14 block area. The values for this block group exceed the high risk thresholds for only one of the 10 characteristics included in the CARPC analysis-education barriers. However, this data reflects a neighborhood in which a pocket of

households that are struggling are living within a larger more stable census tract and neighborhood.

The Brentwood neighborhood counts Lake Mendota, Warner Park, strong schools and the Lakeview library branch among its assets. Notably, few residents perceive the Warner Park Community Recreation Center to be easily accessible, a situation the City hopes to improve upon. The NRT's attention is focused primarily on a small portion of the neighborhood – the 20% or so of the area that contains the most densely populated housing and the highest concentrations of poverty. The neighborhood associations, there are two of them, do not appear to attract a significant number of renters.

There is evidence of an organized neighborhood response in Brentwood, particularly in efforts to develop youth programming. At least two groups have been active with help from church organizations and support from the City through its Emerging Opportunities Program. To date, these groups do not appear to be collaborating with one another, a fact that may be slowing their progress.

There are too many variables involved to expect that a system could be devised which would rank neighborhoods in relative order of their need or readiness for a neighborhood center. Those are decisions that will need to consider a whole host of factors, some more easy to evaluate than others. The availability of the CARPC data offers another objective means by which to try to measure conditions within and across neighborhoods. This first review of data for those neighborhoods discussed above isn't sufficient to draw definitive conclusions but it does confirm that they warrant continued attention.



NEIGHBORHOODS SERVED BY EXISTING CENTERS


Beyond contributing to discussions about where to place new neighborhood centers, the CARPC data might prove useful in at least two other ways. First, as the data continues to be updated and refined, it will be useful in efforts to help measure progress within neighborhoods. That progress might appear in the form of lowered incidences of poverty or unemployment. Or, it might be something more subtle. For instance, the four neighborhoods previously but no longer served by NRTs were once plagued by crime and other problems that drew a considerable amount of City attention and resources. Today, though all exhibit multiple high risk indicators according to the CARPC data, they are no longer experiencing the kind of troubles they once faced. All are served by highly engaged, accessible neighborhood centers that offer an array of programming and provide a positive and stabilizing presence.

The other way the CARPC data may prove useful is in helping to show where there might be gaps in service, including areas already being served by neighborhood centers. For instance, the CARPC data highlights three neighborhoods with multiple barriers that are currently served by neighborhood centers that have a primary orientation toward serving youth. These neighborhoods are: Allied Drive, Bram's Addition/Burr Oaks and Park Ridge/ Park Edge. A center that is oriented toward serving youth may not have the inclination or the capacity to meet demands for programs that address adult education, the financial stability or sustainability of a household or language barriers. This neighborhood data, along with other factors including input from the residents and community partners, should provide the motivation to alter or expand existing efforts or prompt collaborative strategies to meet identified needs.



ATTACHMENT 1: MAP OF CITY-FUNDED NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

City of Madison Neighborhood Center Report




Census Tracts represent data from the 2010 5 year Community Survey - Percentage of Families below the poverty level, (as a percentage of all Households) Percentage field was sorted low to high into 5 quantiles (equal number of records in each quantile)

Green Census Tracts shown are either entirely or partially within the City of Madison and represent the two areas with the most Families below the poverty level.

- Families below the poverty level. 18% - 99% (classified into 5 quantiles)
- Families below the poverty level. 8.7% - 17.9% (classified into 5 quantiles)

Data Source: American Community Survey 2010 5-year estimates.

- Public Schools
- Proposed Community Center Neighborhoods
- Community Centers
- Half Mile buffer
- Neighborhood Resource Team Area
- City of Madison
- Other Cities and Villages



ATTACHMENT 2:

**Neighborhood Center
Descriptions**

BAYVIEW INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

Mission Statement

Bayview's mission is to provide families with quality human services, academic support, arts appreciation, and cultural awareness programs. Over the years, Bayview has actively sought to establish neighborhood safety and stability, as well as support an atmosphere of artistic and cultural vibrancy reflective of its international residents. Bayview is home to families from over 10 different countries, including Laos, Thailand, Nigeria, Ivory Coast, and Mexico.

Historical Information

The Bayview Community Center opened in 1985, under the umbrella of the Bayview Foundation, following a decade of successful management of Bayview Townhouses: HUD subsidized housing management and neighborhood revitalization within the historic Triangle Neighborhood. In 1996, a second story was added to the Center providing more office and meeting space and just as important--a large practice room especially designed for dance. The Center is called Bayview International Center for Education and the Arts but informally known as Bayview.


Current Location and Service Area

The center is located in the midst of Bayview Townhouses, a 102 unit Section 8 project, at the heart of the Triangle Neighborhood. The service area includes Bayview Townhouses and the Triangle neighborhood.

Type of Programs Offered

Bayview offers a variety of youth programs including after-school and summer enrichment programs. The Center also offers a food pantry, a computer lab and the Triangle-Ethnic Festival. Approximately 4,555 unduplicated people have been served in 2011 by Bayview programs and events. Longstanding partnerships with community based organizations, public schools, and universities have resulted in quality resources and programming for the community

BAYVIEW COMMUNITY CENTER



BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF DANE COUNTY – ALLIED

Mission Statement

The Boys and Girls Club of Dane County has a mission to inspire and enable young people, especially those who need us the most, to realize their full potential to become productive, responsible and caring adults.

Historical Information


In the early 1990's Friends Community Housing, Inc.(FCH) purchased several 8 unit apartments in the Allied neighborhood. They offered one unit to be used as a neighborhood center, provided a portion of the rental unit income to support the center and hired a director for the center. The center was named the Allied-Dunn's Marsh Neighborhood Center. The center expanded to 4 apartment units and then to 8. A new group formed, the Allied Dunn's-Marsh Neighborhood Center, Inc (ADMNC), who leased the center space from FCH and operated the center. In 2000, FCH sold the building to ADMC. In 2003, problems with the organization led the City to take ownership of the building and put out a Request for Proposals for an operator of the center. The Boys and Girls Club of Dane County was selected. The BGC operated the center for several years and in 2006 opened a newly constructed free-standing center a block from the previous site.

Current Location and Service Area

Currently, the Boys and Girls Club of Dane County –Allied is located in the heart of the Allied neighborhood. The Center’s programs serve primarily residents of the Allied Drive area but by its charter its service area includes all of Dane County.

Types of Programs Offered

The Center primarily serves elementary, middle and high school youth. At the club, members can enjoy programs such as college club, sports and recreation programs, art, and creative and performing arts programs. The Center also provides programs for families and offers the facility for use by other organizations serving youth, adults and seniors, The Boys and Girls Club organization also provides college preparatory programs in schools around the city. In 2011, the Boys and Girls Club-Allied served 2159 youth, ages 7 to 18.



Total 2014 Allied BGC Budget = \$1,643,755

BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF DANE COUNTY – TAFT

Mission Statement

The Boys and Girls Club of Dane County has a mission to inspire and enable young people, especially those who need us the most, to realize their full potential to become productive, responsible and caring adults.

Historical Information

In 1950, a military barracks at Truax Field was sawed in half and trucked to South Madison. This building served as the first South Madison Neighborhood Center. It was operated by Madison Neighborhood Centers (later named United Neighborhood Centers). In 1979 a fire destroyed the building and fortunately with significant financing from the City of Madison a new building was built. In 1999, upon the dissolution of UNC, the center became an independent non-profit organization and a chartered affiliate of the Boys & Girls Clubs of America. At this time the Center changed its name to the Boys and Girls Club of Dane County.


Current Location and Service Area

Currently, the Boys and Girls Club of Dane County –Taft is located in the heart of South Madison . The Center’s programs serve primarily residents of South Madison but by its charter its service area includes all of Dane County.

Types of Programs Offered

The Center primarily serves elementary, middle and high school youth. At the club, members can enjoy programs such as college club, sports and recreation programs, art, and creative and performing arts programs. The Center also provides programs for families and offers the facility for use by other organizations serving youth, adults and seniors, The Boys and Girls Club organization also provides college preparatory programs in schools around the city. In 2011, the Boys and Girls Club-Taft served 1153 youth, ages 7 to 18.

TAFT - BOYS & GIRLS CLUB



Total 2014 Taft BGC Budget = \$1,673,720

BRIDGE LAKE POINT WAUNONA NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

Mission Statement

The mission of the Bridge Lake Point Waunona Neighborhood Center is to offer growth and enrichment opportunities to neighborhood residents that reflect the changing needs, strengths and diversity of the Bridge Lake Point Waunona community. Our goal is to identify community needs and provide high quality programming to children, youth and adults, in the areas of education, health and nutrition.

Historical Information

In 1986, a City-appointed steering committee of residents involved in a CDBG concentration planning process identified a “neighborhood center” as a top priority for the area. With assistance from the City, a group of neighborhood residents identified a vacant storefront for lease as a neighborhood center. The center operated as a gathering place and a place where neighborhood residents could meet. The Broadway-Simpson center affiliated with United Neighborhood Centers (UNC) and moved from the storefront into a vacant rental unit in the neighborhood. Over time the center expanded to multiple units and expanded its program menu to include youth and adult

programs. At the time of the City's major neighborhood redevelopment effort the center moved to its current site and was renamed the Bridge Lake Point Waunona Center. In early 1999 Friends of the Center, Inc. (FOTC) was established to operate the neighborhood center, as an independent non-profit agency in response to the closing of UNC. The new Center experienced a series of crisis, Board and staff changes and reduced funding from community funders. During 2003, the Center appeared to improve its level of services but lost momentum to a point where the Board decided to close its operation. The CDBG Committee, with the advice of United Way and City Community Services, issued a Request for Proposals and selected the Vera Court Neighborhood Center (VCNC) organization to provide management starting in 2004. The Center has made significant progress during the past 7 years by stabilizing and diversifying its program offerings.

Current Location and Service Area


The Center has two buildings, one at 1917 Lake Point Drive that is the Adult Services Building (owned by the CDA). The second building is at 1910 Lake Point Drive and is the Children and Youth Building (leased from MDC).

The center service area is bordered by Rimrock Road and Lake Mendota on the west and north, Monona Drive on the east, and Broadway on the south. In addition, the service area includes part of the Glendale Elementary Service area including the Owl Creek neighborhood.

Types of Programs Offered

The center offers programs in the areas of academic and enrichment after school programs and summer camp for boys and girls. They also provide a pre-school program for Latino children and their parents, a Latino resource center, a computer lab, GED and English classes. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults, seniors, and Latino residents. In 2011 the center served 5,020 unduplicated total Center usage hours of 13,164.

BRIDGE/LAKE POINT/WAUNONA NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER



EAST MADISON COMMUNITY CENTER

Mission

Founded in 1966, the mission of EMCC is: The East Madison Community Center serves as a neighborhood focal point by collaborating to inspire children and families from the surrounding area to achieve goals, gain skills, and strengthen the community through education, employment, socialization and fitness.

Historical Information


The Center began in humble quarters in a small apartment in the CDA's Truax housing development. The Center initially provided youth with structured activities and adults with a neighborhood-based meeting facility. In 1981 the Center moved into a free standing building owned by the CDA in the heart of the Truax housing development. It later affiliated with United Neighborhood Centers (UNC) and became an independent non-profit agency in 1998 upon UNC's dissolution. In 1995 the center expanded to include a youth sports room, in 1998 it constructed a child day care addition and in 2008 the center added a gym and performance center. EMCC is the Truax focal point and provides nationally recognized youth programs and community-based programs for adults.

Current Location and Service Area

EMCC's primary service area is the Truax Neighborhood. Truax is home to about 500 residents with an average annual household income of \$15,000. EMCC also serves other low income housing areas on Madison's eastside.

Types of Programs Offered

EMCC's offers a wide variety of youth programs , adult programs including fitness programs, a food pantry and a community garden. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults and seniors. In 2011, EMCC served 612 unduplicated participants for a total Center usage hours of 9183. EMCC has an operating budget of under \$450,000.



GOODMAN COMMUNITY CENTER

Mission

The Center's mission is "Strengthening Lives in our Community". We fulfill this mission by working with the community to create resources and programs that address needs and build self-sufficiency.

Historical Information

GCC was incorporated in 1954 as the Atwood Community Center and was founded to serve children and families living in the industrial east side of Madison. In the 1960's the Center became part of United Neighborhood Centers (UNC) and operated under this umbrella organization until 1998 when the Center became an independent non-profit agency after the dissolution of UNC. The Center operated at three sites: the main site and first acquired is the Atwood Community Center, a former lodging house; the second site was acquired a block away in 1998 and served as a youth center; the agency acquired their third site in 2004, the former New Loft (Lussier Teen Center). The Center purchased the former Ironworks site for the development of a consolidated site neighborhood center and opened in 2008 under the name of the Goodman Community Center. Today the Center operates this building providing quality programs for all age groups. The organization has changed significantly over the years in focus of programming, demographics of people served based on the time and the needs of the community.


Current Location and Service Area

The Goodman Community Center is located on the near east side of Madison at 149 Waubesa St. GCC draws participants from all over Madison, but primarily serves families within the Lowell and Emerson Elementary school areas along with O'Keeffe and Whitehorse Middle Schools. East High School is .7 miles away. The Goodman Community Center is also .6 miles away from the Darbo/Worthington Park Community; one of Madison's high needs neighborhoods.

Types of Programs Offered

Since the early 1990's, the center has grown tremendously to its current size with programming for ages 3 through older adults, including preschool through high school enrichment programs, adult employment, health and wellness, senior nutrition and recreational programs, family support and a variety of community wide classes. Although the customer base has grown and changed to reflect a true community, 73.4% of the customers are low income. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults and seniors. In 2011 the Center served more than 34,000 unduplicated people, representing more than 160,000 visits.

GOODMAN COMMUNITY CENTER



KENNEDY HEIGHTS COMMUNITY CENTER

Mission Statement

The mission of the Kennedy Heights Community Center is to create a community support network for low to moderate income families; increase available resources and programs to improve the lives of residents and to develop and present social, educational, recreational and cultural programs for children, youth and adults.

Historical Information


In 1978 residents of the Kennedy Heights neighborhood came together with the hope of fostering a greater sense of community and creating more activities for neighborhood children. In 1983, the neighborhood association began providing programming out of a donated apartment in the Kennedy Heights Townhomes, a 104 unit Section 8 housing complex. In 1986 Kennedy Heights Townhomes secured funding for a center, built a community center and the association incorporated as a non-profit agency. The building had two major additions, one in 1996 and one in 2004; adding a youth space, computer lab, additional office space, and renovating the preschool. The Center operates under the Kennedy Heights Neighborhood Association.

Current Location and Service Area

The Kennedy Heights Community Center is located on the north side of Madison at the corner of Kennedy Rd. and Northport Dr. in the Kennedy Heights Townhomes. The Center primary service area is the 104 units of the Townhomes although frequently individuals from the broader north side are served.

Types of Programs Offered

The Kennedy Heights Community Center offers programs in four core areas: quality child care and education, youth development, access to resources for adults and families and community building. In 2011, the Center served 1,354 unduplicated individuals with an annual budget of \$381,000.



LUSSIER COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER

Mission

The Center's mission is "Building Community, Creating Opportunities, Enriching Education".

Historical Information

The Lussier Community Education Center (formerly the Wexford Ridge Neighborhood Center) was founded as an all volunteer/resident run center in 1979, became a part of United Neighborhood Centers in 1994, and was incorporated as an independent non-profit organization in 1999 upon the dissolution of UNC.

The Wexford Ridge Neighborhood Center was founded in 1979 by a group of low-income residents in a converted unit in the Wexford Ridge Apartments. For many years it operated without paid staff and with a strong community organizing tradition. Over the years it expanded from a single apartment unit to multiple units. In 1994, it became part of United Neighborhood Centers and in 1999 it became an independent non-profit organization upon the dissolution of UNC. In 2009, the organization built an expanded facility and the Center was renamed the Lussier Community Education Center. The tradition of community engagement and leadership development played a large role in the grassroots and capital campaigns that enabled the creation of the Lussier Community Education Center as it is known today.


Current Location and Service Area

The Center is located on the grounds of Jefferson Middle school and Memorial High Schools. The service area encompasses the Westside enrollment area of Memorial High School.

Types of Programs Offered

The Center focuses on providing children, youth, middle and high school programming, adult vocational programming and community building and leadership development programs. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults, seniors, Over 2900 people engaged in more than 6500 hours of programming and activities at the Lussier Community Education Center in 2011. The Center budget was \$842,000.

LUSSIER COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER



MEADOWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

Mission Statement

The purpose of the MNC is to provide a safe, supervised place for youth during the after school and evening hours. It also serves as a place for neighbors to socialize and a place for adult programming. The space is a focal point in the neighborhood to share resources for a better and stronger community.

Historical Information

The Meadowood Neighborhood Center is the newest neighborhood center in the city. Residents of southwest Madison had just completed a neighborhood plan that identified the need for a center as a high priority. Residents asked the City for assistance in developing a center. The City of Madison engaged Madison Metro School District in the development and a center opened in a commercial space in a small strip mall on the southwest side of Madison. The space is leased by the City and managed by Madison School & Community Recreation.


Current Location and Service Area

The Center is located in a store front at the Meadowood Shopping Center on Raymond Road near Toki Middle School. The size of the center is 3100 square feet. The service area boundaries are Verona Road, the beltline, Gammon Road and the City limits. The majority of participants are within .5 mile of the Center.

Types of Programs Offered

The Center provides preschool to Middle School programs, health and educational classes for adults and a variety of services such as emergency food, tax preparation assistance, holiday events, meeting space for neighborhood residents. In 2011, the Center served 1,200 unduplicated people who visited the Center 10,000 times.

MEADOWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER - MSCR



NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE COMMUNITY CENTER

Mission Statement

Our mission statement is to provide high quality programming and social services that facilitate the growth of a diverse, responsible, and welcoming community.

Historical Information

Neighborhood House Community Center is the oldest community center in the City of Madison, founded in 1916. Neighborhood House was established as a meeting/support center and “ethnic home” for the many immigrant groups that were resettling in the City of Madison. It became part of Madison Neighborhood Centers (later named United Neighborhood Centers) in 1949 and became an independent non-profit corporation in 1998 when UNC dissolved. Almost 100 years later, Neighborhood House continues to be a meeting/support center and “ethnic home” for a large number of minority and ethnic organizations, as well as providing neighborhood/community programs and activities.


Current Location and Service Area

Neighborhood House Community Center is located on S. Mills Street in Madison, Wisconsin. Its programming service area is the neighborhoods of Vilas, Greenbush, Dudgeon-Monroe, Regent, Bassett, Monona Bay, Triangle, Burr Oak, Capitol View, and Brams Addition. The Center’s minority and ethnic service area is the entire City of Madison.

Types of Programs Offered

Neighborhood House provides programming for youth to adults. Programs include after-school and summer enrichment programs and social events for adults and families. They are expecting to re-open their food pantry and other programs in the near future. The Center also provides programs for a large number of minority and ethnic groups such as African Fest and Ethnic Fest. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults and seniors. In 2011, Neighborhood House served approximately 5,000 unduplicated participants with a budget of \$127,180.

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE COMMUNITY CENTER



RESILIENCE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

Mission Statement

Envisioning a world of resilient cities filled with clean water, clear air, green landscapes, sustainable and just food systems, and healthy people in economically thriving neighborhoods, the Center for Resilient Cities builds robust and thriving urban communities that are healthy, just, economically viable and environmentally sound. As part of that effort, the Resilience Research Center was built to serve South Madison neighborhoods located south of the Beltline. Over 40% of the population in this area of the city are people of color, including African-Americans, Latinos, and Hmong.

Historical Information

The Resilience Neighborhood Center, known informally as the RNC, opened in August 2012 in the Resilience Research Center at 501 E. Badger Road under the umbrella of the Center for Resilient Cities, a local nonprofit with an 18-year track record of community development and land conservation work. This area of South Madison, extending south to Fitchburg, is geographically isolated from the rest of the city and bordered by the Beltline, Rimrock Road, the wastewater treatment plant, the Nine Springs E-Way. Before the RNC's opening, residents of this area had no

community center, school, or public meeting space. No major public institutions are located in this part of the city.

Current Location and Service Area


The Resilience Neighborhood Center's service area includes the Moorland-Rimrock, Indian Springs, Highland Manor, and Nob Hill neighborhoods of South Madison, all of which are south of the Beltline. It is the polling place for Ward 71 of the City of Madison. In addition to housing the RNC, the building is home to Badger Rock Middle School, a public charter school operated by the Madison Metropolitan School District, which educates 100 children in grades 6-8 through project-based learning and a STEM curriculum grounded in sustainability education; 80% of Badger Rock's students come from the surrounding neighborhoods. The Milwaukee-based Growing Power's Madison operations are also located on site.

Designed and built to LEED Platinum standards, the 2-story building at 501 E. Badger Road includes a certified commercial kitchen space (available for rent), a large multi-purpose room (with cafeteria tables seating 100), a smaller café area that can serve groups up to 40, and a meeting room for up to 20 people. A carpeted commons area on the second floor (shared with Badger Rock during the day) can be used for yoga and exercise classes.

Type of Programs Offered

As a new neighborhood center, the RNC is developing a full array of programming in response to neighbors' interests and needs. Among the activities in its first year of operation, the RNC hosted neighborhood association meetings; monthly lunches for seniors; fall and spring elections; a Health and Wellness Fair; the 6-week (summer) Camp Fun, Food & Fitness for middle school youth, with partner MSCR; and provided space for the 6-week summer Hmong Language and Cultural Enrichment Program (the first of its kind in Wisconsin) offered by the Hmong community. Both summer programs are being offered again in 2014. MSCR provides after-school programming for Badger Rock students and fitness programs for adults. Phitness Plus offers personal training and full body workouts. The 3.85-acre site also includes extensive urban agriculture programming operated by Growing Power-Madison, which offers monthly community dinners in partnership with the RNC.

RESILIENCE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER



Total 2014 RNC Budget = \$1,416,424

VERA COURT NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

Mission Statement

The mission of the Vera Court Neighborhood Center is to offer growth and enrichment opportunities to neighborhood residents that reflect the changing needs, strengths and diversity of the Vera Court community. Our goal is to identify community needs and provide high quality programming to children, youth and adults, in the areas of education, health and nutrition.

Historical Information

The Vera Court center was established in 1993 by a group of people involved in the Vera area. The center affiliated with United Neighborhood Centers (UNC) who offered the needed administrative structure. Early support and guidance was provided by the CDD and Future Madison Housing, the non-profit developer of the center and owner of much of the multi-unit housing surrounding the center. Vera became an independent non-profit agency in 1999 when UNC dissolved. 1999 was a difficult transition year for the center and in October 1999 the center was closed. In February 2000 the center reopened and during the past 11 years the center has made tremendous progress by

providing a stable and professional management and Board structure, increasing and diversifying funding sources, providing quality programs, serving community needs, and offering city wide programs. In 2004, Vera took over the operation of the Bridge Lake Point Waunona Neighborhood Center and in 2011 the center started the Latino Academy of Workforce Development that provides city wide workforce development trainings to Latino residents. Meridian, the rental agent for Future Madison Housing, provides an annual operating subsidy of approximately \$16,000 based upon a formula developed with the CDD as part of the provision of housing assistance for Vera's redevelopment.


Current Location and Service Area

The center is located at 614 Vera Court and has a service area similar to the service area of Mendota Elementary School and Black Hawk Middle School which includes Wheeler Road on the north, Sherman Avenue on the east, Lake Mendota and Macpherson Street on the west and south.

Types of Programs Offered

The Vera center offers a variety of programs for children and youth. The center offers a computer lab, English classes, community events, community assistance, and targeted workforce development and family support to Latinos. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults, seniors, and Latino residents. In 2011, the center served 6,509 unduplicated participants with total Center usage hours of 11,751.

VERA COURT NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER



WIL-MAR NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

Mission Statement

Wil-Mar Neighborhood Center is a community-directed, non-profit organization based in the Williamson-Marquette neighborhood concentrating on: enhancing the quality of life by fostering community building and partnerships; supporting life enriching programs; and providing opportunities and services.

Year Founded: 1969

Independently Incorporated: 1999

Historical Information

The Wil-Mar center was founded in 1969 by United Neighborhood Centers. In 1999, it became an independent non-profit organization upon the dissolution of UNC. Over the last 15 years the center placed an emphasis on building a vibrant community and building a sense of neighborhood pride, belonging and community.

At over 10000 visitors a year, and many more tens of thousands attracted to Wil-Mar sponsored events, the Center is a bustling place. This is accomplished through establishing the value of caring

for the needy and vulnerable through programs and services offered at the Center, as well as promoting the community and building, if you will, a positive brand, through offering celebratory experiences at major special events. aka, La Fete de Marquette, the Willy Street Fair, the Waterfront and Orton Park Festivals.


Current Location and Service Area

The Wil-Mar Neighborhood Center building is located on the isthmus in the Williamson Street and Marquette neighborhoods. The primary service area is an area bounded by Lake Mendota on the north to Lake Monona on the South and Division Street to Blount St. east to west.

Types of Programs Offered

Wil-Mar offers programs and services for all age groups from children to seniors including school year and summer programs for youth and meals and activities for seniors. The Center also offers a large emergency food program including a pantry, meals and overstock bread and produce. Community agencies also utilize the facility to offer neighborhood based programs and community residents utilize the facility for meetings or gathering space. These Facility Use programs address the needs of youth, families, adults and seniors. In 2011, the Center served over 10,000 unduplicated participants with many thousands more that attended festivals sponsored or co-sponsored by Wil-Mar. The 2011 budget was just under \$400,000.

WIL-MAR NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER



WISCONSIN YOUTH & FAMILY CENTER

Mission Statement

WYFC is a youth and family serving, community-based organization, dedicated to providing safe, healthy and meaningful programs and activities to our community.

Historical Information


Wisconsin Youth Company (WYC) operated their administrative offices out of a building located on the southwest side of Madison. Growing concerns of residents and police about escalating crime, violence, not enough positive activities for youth and unsupervised children in the Elver Park neighborhood led to the establishment of the Wisconsin Youth and Family Center (WYFC) at the request of the city. WYC worked with members of the West Side Youth Partnership to provide free space for neighborhood based programs for the area. This partnership center began in the fall of 2004, offering recreational drop-in activities for teens and elementary age children. WYC began as sole operator of the center in 2005. Since the beginning of the center, WYC provided significant funding and staff resources to the center.

Current Location and Service Area

WYFC is located in the heart of the Elver Park neighborhood on Madison’s southwest side. The Center serves neighborhood residents in the Toki, Jefferson, Cherokee and Glacier Edge Middle School attendance areas.

Types of Programs Offered

The centers programs focus primarily on elementary, middle and high school youth. 275 youth were served during 2011. The center also offers family support events.



ATTACHMENT 3:

**Characteristics of Individual
Neighborhood Centers**

PROGRAMS/SERVICES OFFERED BY THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

| Type of Program | Bayview | BGC Taft | BGC Allied | Bridge/Lake Point | Center for Resilient Cities | East Madison | Goodman | Kennedy Heights | Lussier | Meadowood | Neigh. House | Vera Court | Wilmar | WI. Youth | Total * |
|-----------------------------------|---------|----------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Pre-K | | | * | * | | * | * | * | | | > | | | | 5 |
| Elementary - Afterschool | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 13 |
| Elementary - Summer | * | * | * | * | | * | * | > | * | * | * | * | * | * | 12 |
| Middle School - Afterschool | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | > | * | * | * | 12 |
| Middle School - Summer | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | > | * | * | * | 12 |
| High School - Afterschool | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | | * | | * | 11 |
| High School - Summer | | * | * | * | | * | * | | * | * | | * | | * | 8 |
| Youth Employment/Training | | * | * | * | | * | * | > | | | > | * | * | | 7 |
| Restorative Justice/Comm. Service | | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 12 |
| Adult Employment/Training | | | * | * | | * | * | * | * | | > | * | | | 7 |
| Parenting Education/Support | | * | * | * | | * | * | * | > | | * | * | | | 8 |
| Latino Specific Adult | | | | * | | | | | > | | > | * | | | 2 |
| Latino Specific Children/Youth | | * | | * | | | | | | | | * | | | 3 |
| Asian Specific Adult | | | | | | * | | * | > | | > | | | | 2 |
| Asian Specific Children/Youth | | > | > | | * | | | > | | | | | | | |
| Computer Lab | > | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | > | * | * | * | 11 |
| Newsletter | | * | * | * | | * | | * | * | * | > | * | * | * | 10 |
| Newspaper | | | | * | | | * | | | | | * | | | 2 |
| Information & Referral | | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | > | * | * | | 10 |
| Senior Nutrition | | | * | * | | | * | | * | | > | | * | | 5 |
| Senior Activities | * | | * | * | | * | * | | * | * | > | | * | | 8 |
| Latino Specific Senior | | | | * | | | | | | | | * | | | 2 |
| Asian Specific Senior | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Food Pantry | * | | * | * | | * | * | * | * | | * | | * | | 9 |
| Community Garden | > | * | * | * | | * | * | > | > | | | * | | > | 6 |
| Café/Restaurant-food for sale | | | | | | | * | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Farmer's Market | | | | | | | | | * | | | | * | | 2 |
| General/Socialization/job ads | | | | * | | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | | 8 |
| Other - See next page | * | | | | | | * | | * | | | | * | | 4 |

* = Current program

> = Part of strategic plan for future

Bayview Community Garden: Planned improvement
Other: W2 employment

Lussier Other: Social enterprise/job program for people w/disabilities
Collaborative alternative education
VITA Tax Prep

Goodman Other: Athletics for children
Athletics for adults
Free/reduced space for community members
Pregnancy programming for middle/high boys & girls

Wil-Mar Other: Community building/leadership development
VISA
Festivals

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

| Type of Space | Bayview | BGC Taft | BGC Allied | Bridge/Lake Point | Center for Resilient Cities | East Madison | Goodman | Kennedy Heights | Lussier | Meadowood | Neigh. House | Vera Court | Wilmar | WI. Youth |
|---|---------|----------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------|-----------|
| Meeting rms/classrms for public or facility users | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * |
| Gym | | | | | * | | | | | | | | | |
| Large Activity Room | | * | * | | * | * | * | | * | | * | | | * |
| Reception Area | | * | * | * | * | * | * | > | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Executive Director Office | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | | * | * | |
| Commercial Kitchen | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |
| Non-Commercial Kitchen | | * | * | | | * | * | > | * | | > | | * | |
| Outdoor Green Space | * | | | * | * | * | * | * | | * | * | * | | * |
| Outdoor Play Area | * | * | * | | * | * | * | * | * | | | * | | * |
| Without Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outdoor Play Area | * | * | * | * | | | | * | * | | * | | | * |
| With Equipment | | | | | * | | | | | * | | | | |
| Exercise Room | * | * | * | | | * | * | * | * | | > | * | * | |
| Computer Lab | | * | | | | * | * | | | | | | | |

* = Currently a characteristic of center

> = Part of strategic plan for the future

East Madison Community Center Other: Stage/Multi-Purpose Library

Goodman Community Center Other: Mezzanine
Café
Teen Performance
Filming/recording studio
Art rooms

Lussier Other: Recording studio

ATTACHMENT 4:

**CARPC Data on NRT Neighborhoods
and High Need Areas**

(Revised 8/22/14)

CARPC Madison Data

The table below provides a summary of findings as reported in the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission data compiled for their 2013 Fair Equity Housing Assessment and focused for the purposes of this report. Neighborhood data is reported by census tract, and corresponding Neighborhood Resource Teams and Neighborhood Centers are identified. Detailed information by neighborhood follows.

CARPC Data Summary

| Neighborhoods Under Discussion for New Centers | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Neighborhoods</i> | <i>Census Tract Block Group(s)</i> | <i>Corrected City Barrier Thresholds Exceeded</i> | <i>NRT</i> | |
| Brentwood | 22.00(3) | 1 | Brentwood | |
| Darbo Worthington | 20.00 (1) | 8 | Darbo | |
| Leopold | Four CTBG | 1,5,0,6 | Leopold | |
| Owl Creek | 105.01(2) | 3 | Owl Creek | |
| Neighborhoods with Multiple Barriers and Existing Centers | | | NRT | Center |
| Allied Drive | Three CTBG | 8,8,7 | Allied | Boy's and Girl's Club - Allied |
| Balsam Russett | 5.01 (3) | 2 | Balsam Russett | Meadowood |
| Bayview | 12.00 (1) | 5 | None | Bayview |
| Bram's Addition/ Burr Oaks | Four CTBG | 8,4,8,6 | Balsam Russett | Boy's and Girl's Club- Taft |
| Bridge Lake Point | Two CTBG | 3,3 | None | Bridge Lake Point |
| Kennedy Heights | 23.01 (1) | 7 | None | Kennedy Heights |
| Park Ridge/ Park Edge | Two CTBG | 6,0 | Park Edge | Wisconsin Youth Company |
| Rimrock/Moorland | Three CTBG | 7,5,0 | None | Center for Resilient Cities |
| Tamarack Trails/Wexford | 2.04 (1) | 8 | None | Lussier |
| Theresa Terrace | 4.07 (1) | 3 | Theresa Terrace | Theresa Terrace |
| Proposed SW Service area | Six CTBG | 6,3,2,3,0,2 | Park Edge/TT and Balsam Russet | Proposed Griff's property |

NEIGHBORHOOD SPECIFIC DATA

Key to color coding:

- Red:** Percentage reported exceeds city threshold indicating concentration of this characteristic indicates a potential “Barrier to Opportunity” in the designated neighborhood.
- Blue:** Percentage reported falls within 10% of meeting threshold for “Barrier”
- Yellow:** Percentage reported may need further exploration as it seems inconsistent with other indicators, or what is known about the neighborhood.

NEIGHBORHOODS UNDER DISCUSSION FOR NEW CENTERS

Neighborhood 1: Brentwood

Population: 1703

Block groups: 22.00 (3)

Boundaries: Trailways to the North, Sherman to the east, and Sheridan to the west

NRT District: Yes

| Characteristic | Variable | 22.00 (3) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | <i>1703</i> | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 27.8% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 13.0% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 0.8% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 14.4% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 25.4% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 22% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 18.1% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 17.3% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 7.6% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 14.8% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 0 | | |

Neighborhood 2: Darbo Worthington

Population: 1301

Block groups: 20.00 (1)

Boundaries: Commercial Ave on the North, St. Paul on the South and East, Clyde Gallagher and East Washington to the west. Approximately half of this census tract is in the Town of Blooming Grove.

NRT District: Yes

| Characteristic | Variable | 20.00 (1) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | <i>1301</i> | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 46.4% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 43.2% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 2.3% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 19.7% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 51.2% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 35.2% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 18.7% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 28.9% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 13.3% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 28.8% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 8 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 3: Leopold

Population: 6548

Block groups: 14.02(2) 14.02(3) , 14.03(2) (Fitchburg)

Boundaries: Beltline north, Fish Hatchery East, Yarmouth, Leopold Way, Grandview, Nottingham west.

NRT District: Yes

| Characteristic | Variable | 14.02 (2) | 14.02 (3) | 14.02 (4) | 14.03 (2) Fitchburg | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1010 | 2175 | 794 | 2569 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 37.8% | 64.1% | 37.5% | 62.3% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 4.3% | 21.2% | 14.8% | 23.5% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | n/a | 10.5% | n/a | 10.3% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 3.9% | 15.3% | n/a | 12.5% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 16.3% | 26.6% | 3.0% | 39.2% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 26.1% | 20.5% | 34.2% | 36.2% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 6.9% | 16.3% | 4.9% | 12.8% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 23.7% | 27.3% | 22.7% | 28.6% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 12.9% | 3.0% | 3.7% | 11.3% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 19.3% | 36.7% | 8.7% | 23.2% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | |

Neighborhood 4: Owl Creek and Liberty Place/ North of Sigglekow West of I- 90/94

Population: 1637

Block groups: 105.01 (2)

Boundaries: Hwy 12/18 North, I-90/94. East, Sigglekow Rd south, Lakes Mud and Waubesa west.

NRT District: Yes

| Characteristic | Variable | 105.01 (2) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1637 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 35.1% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 23.3% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 7.4% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 9.5% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 13.6% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 35.6% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 7.8% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 33.4% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 11% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 11.7% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 3 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |

NEIGHBORHOODS WITH EXISTING CENTERS AND MULTIPLE BARRIERS

Neighborhood 1: Allied Drive

Population: 5647

Block groups: 6.00 (1) 6.00 (2) Madison and Fitchburg, 6.00 (3) Fitchburg

Boundaries: Hwy 12/18 north, Seminole Hwy east, McKee Rd. South, Verona Rd, west.

NRT District: Yes

Neighborhood Center: Boy's and Girl's Club - Allied

| Characteristic | Variable | 6.00 (1) | 6.00 (2) Madison and Fitchburg | 6.00 (3) Fitchburg | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1557 | 2578 | 1512 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 47.3% | 78% | 63.6% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 34.9% | 30.1% | 41.1% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 2.3% | 12.6% | 10% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 26.9% | 19.2% | 1.9% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 33% | 63.9% | 11.6% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 59.1% | 30% | 34.8% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 8.5% | 13% | 17.1% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 28.8% | 35.3% | 31.2% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 12.7% | 3.5% | 11.8% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 29.6% | 34.2% | 39.1% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 8 | 8 | 7 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 2: Balsam Russett

Population: 1712

Block groups: 5.01 (4)

Boundaries: Raymond Rd to the north, Gilbert Rd to the East, Monticello Rd to the south and Tanager to the west

NRT District: Yes

Neighborhood Center: Meadowood

| Characteristic | Variable | 5.01 (4) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1162 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 33.9% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 12.2% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 7.4% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 3.9% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent | % Single Parent Households | 21.7% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 22.8% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 12.3% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 26.7% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 3.1% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 17.6% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| CARPC Risk Threshold | | 2 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 3: Bayview

Population: 1137

Block groups: 12.00 (1)

Boundaries: Regent and Prouditt on the north, Monona Bay on the South and South Park on the West.

NRT District: No

Neighborhood Center: Bayview Community Center

| Characteristic | Variable | 12.00 (1) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1137 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 46.7% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 42.8% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 4.9% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 40.4% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent | % Single Parent Households | 12.3% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 11.9% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 20% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 14.7% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 22.4% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 19.4% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| CARPC Risk Threshold | | 5 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 4: Bram's Addition/Burr Oaks

Population: 5941

Block groups: 14.01 (1), (2) (3), (4)

Boundaries: Wingra Creek North, Third Ave, Park east, Badger Rd. south, Fish Hatchery west

NRT District: Yes

Neighborhood Center: Boy's and Girl's Club - Taft

| Characteristic | Variable | 14.01 (1) SE and NE | 14.01 (2) SW | 14.01 (3) NW | 14.01 (4) SE and NE | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| <i>Population</i> | | 2147 | 1131 | 1648 | 1015 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 71.2% | 75.7% | 75.7% | 78.4% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 34.8% | 13.4% | 40.5% | 45% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 8.5% | 22.9% | 26.5% | 3.5% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 15.8% | 10.7% | 13.1% | 8.3% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 31.7% | 16% | 55.7% | 68% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 40.5% | 2.1% | 27.8% | 40% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 18.1% | 51.9% | 36.6% | 17.4% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 23.5% | 29.8% | 31.6% | 35% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 15.7% | 1.1% | 11.4% | n/a | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 23.6% | 15.7% | 52.1% | 18.2% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 8 | 4 | 8 | 6 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Neighborhood 5: Bridge Lake Point

Population: 1999

Block groups: 15.01 (1),(2)

Boundaries: South of Lake Monona, West of City of Monona; East of Railroad tracks, North of the Beltline

NRT District: No

Neighborhood Center: Bridge Lake Point

| Characteristic | Variable | 15.01 (1) | 15.01 (2) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1298 | 701 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 46.1% | 20.4% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 14.5% | 25.2% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 8.4% | 8.4% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 9.5% | 2.4% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 30% | n/a | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 11.8% | 48.3% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 5.5% | 9.3% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 22.5% | 19% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 9.6% | 15.7% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 12.4% | 14.9% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 0 | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 6: Kennedy Heights

Population: 1959

Block groups: 23.01 (1)

Boundaries: Havey Rd to the North, mandrake and Northport to the east, Troy drive to the South and the Railroad tracks to the west.

NRT District: No

Neighborhood Center: Kennedy Heights

| Characteristic | Variable | 23.01 (1) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1959 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 58.8% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 39 % | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 1.1 % | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 17.3 % | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 55.4 % | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 30.9% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 18.6% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 35.7% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 14.3% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 42.9% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 7 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 7: Park Ridge/ Park Edge

Population: 4129

Block group(s): 4.07(2), 4.05 (4)

Boundaries: Schroeder Rd on the north, Chapel Hill and Frisch on the east, Hammersley south and McKenna west

NRT District: Yes

Neighborhood Center: Wisconsin Youth Company

| Characteristic | Variable | 4.07 (2) | 4.05 (4) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1938 | 2191 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 49% | 39.3% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 17.1% | 1.8% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 6.9% | 6.2% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 6.8% | n/a | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 20.2% | 8.8% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 45.1% | 17.5% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 22.9% | 2.2% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 29.1% | 24.9% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 8.1% | 5% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 25.4% | 0.8% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 6 | 0 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 0 | 3 | | |

Neighborhood 8: Rimrock/Moorland

Population: 5399

Block groups: 15.02 (1), (2), (3)

Boundaries: Beltline on the North, Park on the West, Mud lake chain on the east, and Nine Springs Creek and Libby Rd to the South.

NRT District: No

Neighborhood center: Center for Resilient Cities

| Characteristic | Variable | 15.02 (1) Town of Madison | 15.02 (2) | 15.02 (3) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|--|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1406 | 1153 | 2840 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 67.1% | 54.9% | 41.2% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 15.9% | 36.8% | 6.1% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 8.6% | 8.4% | 5.1% | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 24.2% | 1.5% | 4.9% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent | % Single Parent Households | 33.6% | 45.9% | 20.1% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 31.5% | 31.5% | 17.9% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 21.4% | 8.9% | n/a | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 27% | 25.5% | 25 % | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 18.7% | 10.1% | 10.7% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 20.5% | 36.2% | 0.9% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| CARPC Risk Threshold | | 7 | 5 | 0 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | 2 | 3 | | |

Neighborhood 9: Tamarack Trails CCA /Wexford

Population: 1525

Block groups: 2.04 (1)

Boundaries: Old Sauk Rd. to the north, Gammon road east, Mineral Point south and Westfield Rd. West

NRT District: No

Neighborhood Center: Lussier Community and Education Center

| Characteristic | Variable | 2.04 (1) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1525 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 43.2 % | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 41.4% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | 1.6 % | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 18.5 % | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent Families | % Single Parent Households | 44.2 % | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 42.8% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 15.4% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 29.4% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 9.8% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 33.6% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| Exceeded CARPC Risk Threshold | | 8 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 1 | | |

Neighborhood 10: Theresa Terrace

Population: 1546

Block groups: 4.07 (1)

Boundaries: Hammersley Rd North, Prairie Rd on the east, Raymond Rd south and McKenna West

NRT District: Yes

Neighborhood Center: Theresa Terrace

| Characteristic | Variable | 4.07 (1) | City Risk Threshold | Within 10% of City Risk Threshold |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Population</i> | | 1938 | | |
| 1. Segregation | % Non white persons | 49.2% | 41.5% | 37.3% |
| 2. Poverty | % Persons below poverty | 12.1% | 27.9% | 25.1% |
| 3. Language Barriers | % Limited English Proficiency | n/a | 6.6% | 5.9% |
| 4. Mobility Limitations | % Households with no Vehicle | 13.1% | 18.2% | 16.4 % |
| 5. Single Parent | % Single Parent Households | 11.8% | 29.4% | 26.5% |
| 6. Housing Cost Burden | % Households paying more than 50% rent | 28.5% | 38.2% | 34.3% |
| 7. Education Barriers | % Adults with less than High School education | 8.3% | 12.9% | 11.6% |
| 8. Youth Concentrations | % Children under 18 years | 32.1% | 26.7% | 24% |
| 9. Unemployment | % Unemployed | 7.3% | 10.9% | 9.8% |
| 10. Public Assistance | % Receiving Food Share | 24.6% | 20.8% | 18.7% |
| CARPC Risk Threshold | | 3 | | |
| Within 10% of City Risk Threshold | | 0 | | |