The Constraints and Potentials of "Formalized Community Organizations" —A Qualitative Analysis of The Public Housing Agency "Resident Council" and the "Neighborhood Council "of US Cities—

Soichiro MAEYAMA, Oscar DURÁN

Abstract

As "new social risks" develop in our ever changing communities, as well as in the direction of public-policy "welfare to work", how might our civilizations respond in terms of developing more impactful systems of community organizations? Where an overabundance of quantitative analysis often deduces an ineffectiveness and antiquation of current strategies, authors Maeyama and Durán present a fresh approach to how, we as a global community, should begin to analyze such initiatives.

In this study, the authors explore the framework of current US based "Formalized Community Organizations", which are unique organization initiatives established by US government agencies. Through interviews and "practitioner reflections," the authors initiate an examination of the composition of such organizations and explore the various problems associated with their use. The two authors illustrate their collective specializations and commitment to the Neighborhood Council (NC) system in Japan and the United States (Maeyama), and to the Resident Council (RC) system of Public Housing Agencies of the United States (Durán).

The qualitative examination of the two system frameworks and their related challenges reveal the primary findings. First, confirmation of the nuances between the institutional features of "Formalized Community Organizations" (legal basis, governmental subsidies, advisory powers, and their organizational mission). Second, an early introduction and understanding of the inherent purpose of each system and their actual relation to the actual welfare support situations in neighborhoods, as well as their relation to human service sector. Finally, that there exists an abundance of data yet to be collected before we can holistically analyze the effectiveness of these human services systems.

Keywords : Neighborhood Council, Resident Council, welfare state/ welfare regime,
　　　　　 Public Housing Agency (PHA)/ Housing Authority,
　　　　　 special purpose government

1. Backgrounds and Purpose of the Study

New Social Risks and growing social implications of community organizations

What will become of society during the next drastic social change? How will the "welfare state" or

"welfare social regime" be perceived or evolve? The combination of globalization, neo liberalization, and the COVID-19 pandemic have all contributed to an increase in the number of people exposed to "new social risks". New risks which will likely threaten the current state of social justice work such as: access to quality employment, access to safe and affordable housing, and the overall state of the global social services sector across the United States, European countries, and Japan alike. Even more challenging, these "new social risks" are increasingly perceived as no longer being supporting by the existing welfare state system.

Since the 1990s, the welfare triangle theory of Esping-Andersen (1990) has been widely accepted in welfare state theory. For those unfamiliar, the theory states; society is supported by three sectors: the state, the market, and the family. However, in light of the current global social climate, the "welfare diamond theory," which holds that it is the "community" that is necessary to support people's well-being, has garnered popularity (Jenson 2015).

1.1 Formalized Community Organizations (formal neighborhood organizations)

Community Practice refers to a social movement which arises from; a community, a self-help initiative cast by the people, participatory democracy as a value and a stile or organizing, or through political interest groups' involvement in the larger political system. In 2017 Cnaan & Milofsky, organized a full-fledged study of "community practice" by analyzing a 45-member team. Surprisingly, this ambitious study was the first time scholars attempted such an analysis head on. The results of the study were fruitful, and through their gained insights, the two researchers were able to systematize the contents of Community Practice.

Advanced with this new assortment of Community Practice aspects, researchers now have the opportunity to effectively penetrate the reality and dynamics of formalized community organizations.

Among the handful of idenfied aspects, this paper focuses on community organizations themselves as well as issue associated with "Formalized Community Organizations". More on this later.

There are a variety of Formalized Organizations related to spatial communities or neighborhoods such as community associations, block associations, neighborhood alliances, Community Development Corporations (CDCs) etc. in US, deployments of them have been richly addressed in various forms for community developments in different locations and in different contexts (Green & Haines 2001).

In consideration of the new social risks mentioned above, the question to arise is what kind of community structures, activities, and community organizations are needed to respond to these new social risks in a more resilient and flexible manners. In relation to our initial point, how is this related to a new welfare social regime. Beyond the "welfare to workfare" that was once touted about the welfare policy, a new support system that can effectively support people is being questioned. To our understanding, the germ of such a system is emerging in the "Formalized Community Organizations" as shall be mentioned later. Rather than focus on the new support system in communities itself, this paper seeks to investigate the dynamism of support within the communities.

This study considers the following dynamics of, "Formalized neighborhood organizations":
- They are entities institutionally formed and established by local governments or quasi-governmental entities.
- The format of the entity is institutionally provided by local governments or quasi-governments (through ordinance, resolution, City-guideline).
- The entity usually receives a certain amount of budgetary measures and technical support from the local government or quasi-governments.

・The substantial deployment are sustained by residents' works and contributions.
・The mission of these groups is to form and sustain a "public sphere" for residents to engage in public policy, as well as for the governments to finely communicate with the residents.

1.2 "Formalized Community Organizations"
― Public Housing Agency (Housing Authority) and Neighborhood Council―

1.2.1 Neighborhood Council

Neighborhood councils have been established by local governments and sustained by neighborhood citizens since 1970s (Hallman 1977), mainly since late 1980s (neighborhood council movement).
Cities such as Portland (OR), Minneapolis (MN), Dayton (OH), and Birmingham (AL) are developing and sustaining Neighborhood Council system.

Neighborhood Councils are "neighborhood bodies which have some kind of official or quasi-official relationship with local government" and "an official or quasi-official representative body for the neighborhood" (Hallman 1977). Neighborhood movement of citizens and civic activists, partly inspired by the "neighborhood government" initiative (M.kotler 1966) , as well as the federal government's "citizen participation" requirements in the formulation of core municipal plans, have led to the emergence of neighborhood council programs in earliest cases in the 1970s, but mainly in the 1980s and early 1990s. Basically, on one hand the city government establishes the Neighborhood Council program by ordinance as an "advisory role to city government", "vehicle for communication between local citizens and the city government". On the other hand, the neighborhood citizens fill in the development through their activities. Berry et al. (1993) and their team described it as "citywide structured systems for citizen participation"

and studied it in 15 cities. As we mention later, in some city (Seattle) there occured a sensational demolition of the Neighborhood Council system by City Mayor Order. The meaning of the Neighborhood Councils, especially in terms of their institutional existence or ontology, has been questioned and continues to attract attention.

Researchers such as Cooper (2005), O'Grady (2019), University of Washington (2018) conducted surveys and provided perspectives on recent situation of neighborhood councils in the cities such as LA (CA), Tacoma (WA).

1.2.2 "Resident Council"(RC) and "Resident Advisory Board"(RAB) of Public Housing Agencies (PHAs)

Over 3,000 Public Housing Agencies (PHAs)/ Housing Authorities, as local public housing agencies, exist and treat the public housing services (1.1 million units of public housing; serve an astounding 2.2 million residents) in U.S. The legal framework is "special purpose government" (Maeyama 2020). However, it is taken that the PHAs were only fulfilling the function of rental housing in the 1970s and 1980s. The public housing sites of PHAs came to be known as "public slums." Since 1998, the PHA challenged to reform itself, especially in the 21st century, in the form of organizational, financial and developmental reforms. As the result, they have strongly promoted new housing projects that incorporate human services for the residents in its charge as to a movement.

Since PHAs are strongly linked to welfare and human services in their housing programs, RC and RAB are perceived as suitable theme to examine in relation to the "welfare to workfare" perspective. In this article we especially are focusing on "Resident Council" and "Resident Advisory Board".

Given what the two types of councils have in common as their base, these are the social endeavor that provides an officially structured neighborhood-based framework for citizens' quality of life improvement by self-help initiatives (reaching

out to the government/ advisory role, communication for each other, communication between residents and government). In one word, a mechanism that sustains the public "trust framework".

1.3 Purpose of the study

1.3.1 Purpose

This research explores to set a framework as "Formalized Community Organization", the unique organizational form and existence backed by governments, and to confirm the mechanism and substantial phases of them.

This involves and relates to the "welfare-to-work" public policy-directions in present "new social risks" situation.

1.3.2 Methodology

As to a method, this paper tries to clarify the components, configuration of the system and the phases of the problems linked to them by way of interviews (for Neighborhood Council) and the "practitioner's reflection" (for Resident Council).

2 Public Housing Agencies (PHA) and Resident Council & Resident Advisory Board—US Public Housing & The Housing Choice Voucher Programs

As we progress through our analysis of resilient structures and activities responding to new social risks, we will now look to two federally supported strategies utilized in the special purpose government entities Public Housing Agencies (PHA)s, also known as Housing Authorities; The Resident Council (RC) and the Resident Advisory Board (RAB). Through these two mechanisms, citizen participation is poised as a paramount element, which all PHAs are mandated to recognize in management of their community's federal housing programs. Prior to offering a description and

discussion on the two resident participation systems, it is important to first describe the ecosystem in which they are operate. Both resident systems operate in one of HUD's two primary housing assistance programs; the Public Housing Program and the Housing Choice Voucher program.

2.1 The Public Housing Program

In 1937, the United States initiated what would evolve into its second large scale housing initiative, the Public Housing program. As part of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the program was issued as one of the last major pieces of legislation passed as part of the New Deal (Schwartz, 2014). As a result of the natural impacts which followed World War II, the program had a very slow start.

Between 1934 and the time of the 1940 Census, the US government built and leased 30,151 units of public housing[1]. During World War II, the program's emphasis shifted from housing constructed primarily for working class families who were "temporarily poor" as a result of the Great Depression, to building housing for defense industry workers. Through the Housing Act of 1949, the US government reauthorized the program armed and made a national commitment to build 810,000 units over the subsequent six years. The US would eventually hit this goal, however not until the year 1968. By 1950, the US had upwards of 150,000 public housing units built nationally. From this base of housing units, the program would see a more rapid expansion over the next two decades (Thompson, 2006).[2] Since its inception, the program has remained a well-covered and discussed topic among researchers, academics, and policy analysis alike. With varying opinions on its effectiveness and impact to the communities and families it serves, the fact remains the public housing is the oldest and, until recently, the largest housing subsidy program in the country. The National Low income Housing Coalition shares that today's 1.1

million units of public housing are operated by over 3,000 local public housing agencies[3], and serve an astounding 2.2 million residents.[4]

So, what exactly is the Public Housing Program? The term Public Housing is used in two ways; first as an umbrella term which houses other sub programs, secondly and more important to the scope of this section, name Public Housing refers to the official name of a specific rental housing program. As an umbrella term and in its modern context, the strategies of the Public Housing program have evolved and grown since its mid-1930's inception. Today, the program has evolved to also serve as an umbrella ideal that houses a collection of sub programs built within HUD's *Office of Public and Indian Housing* (PIH). First, one major sub program, which we will reference later, is the *Capital Fund Program* (CFP). Through the CFP, the office of PIH awards funds, annually, to every single Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) for the development, financing, and modernization of their public housing developments and for management improvements. Secondly, *Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency* (ROSS) program, if utilized, seek to offer individuals living in Public Housing communities with supportive services, resident empowerment activities, and assistance in becoming economically self-sufficient. Thirdly, even the *Housing Choice Voucher* (HCV) program, formally referred to as Section 8, is listed by HUD (US Office of Housing and Urban Development) as the sub program.

At its core, the Public housing was established to provide "decent and safe rental housing for eligible low-income families, the elderly, and persons with disabilities". This mission's intention is the beating heart of Public Housing developments across the country. The rental housing available thought the program comes in all sizes and types. The range of types span from scattered site single-family housing to high rise apartments focused for elderly families, and cover everything between.

Limited to low-income families and individuals. PHAs determine program applicant's eligibility based on HUD mandated standards and baselines such as annual gross income, age, disability status, citizenship or eligible immigration status. PHAs are further allowed to customize a priority of service to specific populations of the communities. This flexibility is accomplished by establishing local preferences, which serve as guide that the PHA uses to process the order of its program applicant pool. Initially approved applicants are ordered on what is referred to as waiting list of the communities. The family's application information is then verified with specific attention to household makeup, financial qualification, criminal history, and any preferences utilized. Once the family's eligibility is confirmed, they are then moved into an available unit of housing.

All families sign a lease with the PHA, who owns and manages the property. Subsides range from participant to participant, however a national standard allows PHAs to establish their minimum rent between $0 - $50 US monthly for their housing. A family can continue to reside in Public Housing so long as they comply with their lease and their family's income prevents access to obtain housing in the private market.

2.1.2 The Choice Voucher (HCV) Program

After four decades of growth, HUD's largest housing subsidy program for low income Americans is the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program. The HCV program, formally known as Section 8, was established as America's first voucher program via the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (Schwatz 2014). The HCV program has grown rapidly since its release and according to recent data from the PIH Office, as of June 2021, there are nearly 2.3 million HCV housing units leased up at an average unit cost of $807 per household (PIH, 2021)[5].

To deploy the program, HUD issues an annual budget authority and establishes a maximum

number of vouchers a PHA. The PHA is then able to use that budget authority to qualify and serve families within their program budget. Federal funds are thansfer monthly to a PHA's in the form of budget authority deposits to support the PHA in administering the HCV program. Participating families receive their housing assistance by way of the PHA acting on behalf of the family, to pay a portion of their rent directly to a private market landlord. The participant's rental subsidy amount varies according to that unique family's income qualifications. The remaining rent owed to the landlord, after the subsidy payment from the PHA, is the responsibility of the HCV family.

One of the potentially biggest advantages from the participant perspective, is participants are free to choose any housing that meets the requirements of the program which is located in the PHAs jurisdictional service area. A natural program tradeoff for some is, that since the PHA does not own the property the family will live in, the family or individual participant, must locate their own housing in the competitive private market of the PHAs jurisdiction. Once the selected home passes agency Housing inspection, the family is officially able to move into their home and utilize the HCV subsidy. Through the HCV program, the PHA has a program agreement with the participants, a separate agreement with the landlord the participants have selected and qualified for, and lastly the participant has a lease agreement with the landlord.

A final primary difference between the Public Housing and HCV programs we wish to highlight is where the subsidy is attached to and ultimately how that location impacts the nature of the subsidy and who it serves. Through the Public Housing program, the subsidy is tied to the unit owned and operated by the PHA. As a result, the families who use the Public Housing program must live in the community serviced by the local PHA. In the HCV program, subsidized vouchers are tied to qualified families not specific unit. As a result, once in the HCV program the family,

within a certain timeframe set by the local PHA's Administrative plan, may take their voucher with them if they decide to move to a different PHA jurisdiction anywhere in the US or US territories using the HCV program. PHAs refer to this as portability.

For both Public Housing Program and HCV program, similar HUD program requirements include annual recertification of families, annual inspections of subsidized housing units, abiding by a lease, in addition to being required to communicate changes in their family makeup or their household finances to the PHA regularly.

Now that we have a better described the program habitats of the two resident participation systems, we shall take a deeper look into the systems themselves. In considering the Resident Council and Resident Advisory Board systems, we will offer a brief outline of how residents, via these two tools, have influence in their communities and homes. We shall then illustrate how HUD has evolved its support of residential participation within the foundations of the two largest US housing subsidy programs and will consider the challenges faced by these systems.

2.2 PHAs' Formalized Community Organizations & Support Services

2.2.1 Resident Councils

A Resident Council is a formalized body of residential governance operating within the Public Housing program. They are in essence a Neighborhood Association whose neighborhood is a Public Housing community. However, the RC additionally has backing and encouragement of their existence through federal regulation. They are teams of Public Housing Neighbors, who are duly elected volunteers who have a dedicated interest in their community. According to HUD regulations, the role of a Resident Council (RC) is to improve the quality of life and level of resident satisfaction in their neighborhoods. HUD charters

reflect and represent the Public Housing residents served by the PHA. HUD issues a caution to PHAs that they should give adequate notice of its intentions to the residents and still encourage the residents to form resident councils that comply with the tenant participation regulations.

There exists a growing narrative in regard to challenges faced in fostering and developing these Associations. Some study perspectives on the issues and conflicts that arise in RCs or aground RCs. Chenault (2015) points out about the issues: "There is a need for access to residencies with leadership training and experience. In ordinary cases residents are not accustomed to being leaders, and this needs to be addressed first". Addition reports speak of tension and lack of trust between residents and PHA leadership, other reports speak of distrust between RC members and other PHA residents, and of course, natural challenges arisen from the nature of several social groups, each with different values and attitudes, which often lead to conflict and discord.

2.2.3 The Resident Opportunity and Self Sufficiency (ROSS) Program

An additional resident supportive service strategy is the ROSS program. Handfuls of PHA's have received a competitive federal grant award to support the establishment this new human service program within the Public Housing program of an awardee. Said awardees then add a specialized staff member (ROSS Coordinator) dedicated purely to running and identifying and linking family services to residents, many of whom are involved in RCs. The ROSS Coordinator then establishes relationships in the PHA's Public Housing communities to bring these services and networks to the PHA families to improve their levels of selfsufficiency. Such programs may include activities relating to: Work readiness services, including education, job training and counseling, job search skills, business development training, tutoring,

adult literacy, computer access, personal and family counseling, health screening and other health services, transportation, and child care; Economic and job development, including employer linkages and job placement, and the start-up of micro-enterprises.

2.2.3 The Resident Advisory Board

There is not an authorized Resident Council system, as outlined above, that exists within the HCV program. Rather, opportunity for resident participation come in the form of the Resident Advisory Board.

The Resident Advisory Board (RAB) is a resident participatory system in which appointed residents of both the Public Housing and HCV programs, assist their PHA with reviewing the Annual PHA plan. One of the primary regulations governing PHAs, requires they complete, share for public comment, have locally approved, and submit an annual plan. The plan must show how the PHA will operate their programming in the next fiscal year. Every PHA must have an annual plan in addition to a 5-year action plan.

HUD requires that each PHA establish one or more RABs as part of its PHA planning process. RAB membership is comprised of individuals who are a good reflection of the residents the PHA serves. Since the main role of the RAB is to make recommendations in the development of the PHA Plan, HUD encourages PHAs on garnering the RAB's participation early in the planning process.

Unlike RC, RABs are not required to duly elect officers, nor are they required to meet regularly. Rather, the RAB is more of team of residents that is convened once a year for one specific purpose, the PHA Annual plan. It can still serve as an effective opportunity for resident participation, however due to its sporadic and focused nature, resident input is more of a once off process until the next years plan.

2.3 Practitioner Refraction for case study

In order to grasp the actual situation and issues of the Resident Council, Resident Advisory Board, the PHAs Formalized Community Organizations in a specific test case, the reflection of the practitioner in charge is examined.

2.3.1 Practitioner Reflections: The Municipal Housing Agency of Council Bluffs, Iowa

"I am proud to serve my nation as a housing advocate. I feel it pertinent to note, that at my heart I am a grassroots Community Revitalist. Thirteen years of front-line neighborhood revitalization and development work has shown me my place in this world as an engaged citizen and public servant who is passionate about two things, people and housing. Years ago, my journey as a neighborhood volunteer led to postulating housing issues and solutions in my lower income neighborhood located in the central region of the US in Omaha, Nebraska Metropolitan Statistical Area. Over the years I worked with hundreds of residents, facilitated hundreds of neighborhood meetings, mentored countless youth and families in the science of neighboring, and collaborated with many neighborhood advocates to mobilize local institutional assets to improve the housing stock of our communities.

In my time serving neighborhoods and residents, I have had the privilege of being a member of several highly functional and impactful teams who have seen the establishment of neighborhood focused non-profits and initiatives. As an affordable housing professional, I have been part of great leadership teams who served institutions that designed and deployed some of the more innovative approaches to neighbor engagement initiatives and affordable housing programming. I feel it pertinent to illustrate how the two worlds of resident engagement and affordable housing merged in my life and positioned me to have a unique vantage point in this field.

Today, I have the privilege of serving my community as the Executive Director of one of our areas local PHAs, the Municipal Housing Agency of Council Bluffs. I entered this role in June of 2020, mid pandemic, and as a result had to learn a lot on resident needs very quickly. The Municipal Housing Agency of Council Bluffs (MHA) serves a town of 65,000 residents located along the Missouri river. Our community spans some 45 square miles and is part of the larger Omaha MSA and is about the 9th largest metropolitan in our predominantly rural state of Iowa. MHA's jurisdiction is the city limits of Council Bluffs, IA.

MHA is what HUD refers to as a large PHA, meaning that we oversee a portfolio of between 1,000 – 4,999 housing units. Our PHA offers both the Public Housing and HCV programs, and we are what HUD designates as a High Performing agency. We have two Public Housing Communities in our program, one eight story tower with 210 housing units, and a three-story community with 85 additional units. All of our units of Public Hosing are efficiencies and 1 bedroom. Due to local occupancy regulations, these unit sizes limit us to serving at most two-person households. This translates to few to no families with children being served by our agency's Public Housing program with many of our families being on fixed incomes.

Our HCV program, combined with our additional special purpose voucher programs, serves an additional 800 families, which fluctuates from month to month. We have about 700 traditional HCV vouchers and about 100 special purpose vouchers (for veterans, Disabled households under the age of 62, or foster youth who have exited the system and such). This brings the total of families served by our PHA to roughly 1,100 families at any given time between our two programs. We have team of 23 staff members including myself and operate with a highly humanitarian approach to our work. Our agency has served the Council Bluffs community since 1970 when its first Public Housing community, Regal Towers opened its doors for the first time. "

2.3.2 Practitioner Reflections: The Challenges of the RAB & RC at MHA

"When I began my post in June of 2020, MHA was just beginning its PHA planning process. This stroke of luck and coincidence presented an opportunity to learn what the current state of our resident engagement process looked like, all in my first week of work. The meeting was held first thing on a Monday morning at roughly 9 am, and to my surprise only three residents attended that RAB meeting. It felt like my first time going to neighborhood meetings where only 3-4 people would attend. MHA does not have a complaint RC in either Public Housing community. As a result, as outlined in our previous section, MHA had to rely on its Resident Advisory Board (RAB) solely for its PHA planning processes.

After the meeting, I spoke to the retiring Executive Director about the meeting. She explained that that was the level of interest among the residents at that time. She went on to explain that there used to be active RC in the early 1990's. She elaborated that as certain residents passed away or moved away, the structures and the established leadership capital dissolved.

Over the next few weeks, I met with the Housing Specialists who were tasked with inviting persons to attend the RAB meetings. I was actively trying to learn more on the RAB recruitment processes. The invitation letters that were sent out were okay. There was a notice in the paper adverting the event, but I know that is always a long shot for getting people in the door. Perhaps the biggest opportunity I saw was in intentional asks. I decided to apply some tactics I picked up in my neighborhood days when I sought to grow resident attendance and engagement at our community meetings.

After that first meeting, I reviewed the regulations to assure our PHA was compliant in our processes. Fortunately, no problem. I tuned my attention to searching out guides and or best practices published on resident engagement strategies by PHAs. I turned up very little. This is not surprising as this is a similar trend in traditional neighborhood level development research. As I began reaching out to fellow Directors and program specialists of PHA's in our actual family served class, I learned of similar challenges in their PHAs. Though MHA is deemed a large PHA, we are at the lower end of that spectrum. This translated to substantially less monetary support for these types of activities. Additionally, our smaller size meant less less time resources from our worked hard team to deploy more aggressive and proactive outreach initiatives with our families.

As I continued through that first summer of 2020, I sought to get to know my staff personally and professionally. Though they were knowledgeable of the regulations applied to how we operated, none of them were versed, or had experience organizing or mobilizing resources and people. I decided I wanted to have another go at it. Four months later, after making some communication adjustments, shifting our outreach approach, and lengthening our facilitation strategy just a little, we had more than 65% of our Public Housing households attend the next meeting. This led me to the first and primary challenge in ways we can grow resident participation work. We need to different types of training, research, and best practices established regarding Resident Participation work. A great example of this, can be seen in the book, "The Unseen: Resident Councils, Communities, and Change" (2015). As already mentioned, the Author, Tiffany Chenault writes a compelling narrative on the challenges of working with and through Resident Councils.

I wish to stress that I am confident there are many PHAs doing marvelous work in the arena of Resident Participation. My intentions in sharing the limitations I see in practice are presented to illustrate the largest hurdle I see in front of us as housing and neighborhood advocates is, we must develop different

types of research from practitioner perspectives. "

2.4 Consideration

As to the legal basis and structure of Resident Council the following points are confirmed (Table 1).

- ・The basic structure of RCs is that they are set up by the residents of the PHAs' sites. PHA, one kind of special purpose government is the entity that deals with them (Radford 2013; Maeyama 2020). HUD secured the establishment of the entity (RC) by way of the US Federal Code of Regulations (CFR).
- ・The purpose of RC is to "improve the quality of life and level of resident satisfaction in their neighborhoods", and it specifically guarantees the opportunity for input in all areas of the PHA's operations. (Occupancy, general management, maintenance, security, resident training, resident employment, social services, and modernization priorities).
- ・The establishment of the RC requires a formal vote of the officers (residents).
- ・As to budgeting, PHA is authorized by the HUD to provide operating subsidies, namely Tenant Participation Funds (TPF) for RCs (e.g., election of RCs, establishment of organizations, training, etc.).

In terms of organizational ontology, RC is recognized as a Formalized Community Organization.

Table 1　Legal Basis and Structure of Resident Council

local government in charge of	public housing authority (special purpose government)
legal basis	the US Federal Code of Regulations (CFR)
structure	entity established by PHAs' site residents
establishment process	vote
budget	Tenant Participation Funds(TPF)
connecting to other program	Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency(ROSS) etc.

2) Issues and Resources

Through the examination, the following issues; possibilities and resources have emerged in the settings surrounding RC.

<Issues>

- ・"the level of interest among the residents"
- ・"structures and the established leadership capital dissolved"（passed away or moved away）
- ・lack of "experience organizing or mobilizing resources and people" among PHA staffs
- ・The PHA has few human resources to respond
- ・access to residents with leadership training or experience
- ・tensions and or depleted trust between Residents and PHA leadership
- ・misunderstanding between RC members and other residents
- ・issues and relations between different social groups with competing agendas

< Possibilities and resources>

- ・"communication adjustments, shifting our outreach approach, and lengthening our facilitation strategy"
- ・Subsidies for the operation of RCs
- ・Executive Directors of PHAs as/ from "Grassroots Community Revitalists"

3. City Governments and Neighborhood Councils

In 2016, an eye-catching article was reported: "Seattle Mayor Ed Murray issued an executive order that will soon terminate the City's official relationship with the 13 district councils."(URBANIST (August 26, 2016), Seattle To Cut Official Ties With Neighborhood District Councils)[9]. The City of Seattle launched national-wide known "Top" neighborhood planning in 1987, that generated Neighborhood Plans, Neighborhood Councils, Neighborhood Fund etc. The city mayor's executive order provoked a great deal of debate among the citizens, but in the end this "citywide structured systems for citizen participation" was demolished.

Seattle does not have "Formalized Community Organizations" at present. The meaning of the Neighborhood Councils, especially in terms of their institutional existence or ontology, has been questioned and continues to attract attention.

Neighborhood Councils are "neighborhood bodies which have some kind of official or quasi-official relationship with local government" and "an official or quasi-official representative body for the neighborhood" (Hallman 1977). Berry et al. (1993) and their team described it as "citywide structured systems for citizen participation" and studied it in 15 cities. Researchers such as Cooper (2005), O'Grady (2019), University of Washington (2018) conducted surveys and provided perspectives on recent situation of neighborhood councils in the cities such as LA (CA), Tacoma (WA).

In this section, first we will confirm the system of the neighborhood council system at the city of Tacoma as a benchmark, and secondly, we will attempt to grasp the situation through interviews with a charged-city staff.

3.1 Structure of Neighborhood Council
– Case Study of the City of Tacoma

Taking the previous definition further, here a specific city, Tacoma (Washington) is taken as the benchmark for outlying the system.

Tacoma, Washington, a city of about 218,000 people, took a relatively long time to establish a Neighborhood Council system after the Neighborhood Council movement began, holding forums among citizens and working to resolve questions and concerns among city council members. Over the years the Neighborhood Council system was established. As the result, it has been sustained in an institutionally stable manner.

In 1992, the City Council established Tacoma's eight Neighborhood Councils to "advise them on issues of local importance and to seek consensus among residents on specific plans of action". The Neighborhood Councils also undertake a wide range of neighborhood improvements in collaboration with staff from the City of Tacoma and other agencies.

Each Neighborhood Council[10] serves as an independent, non-profit citizen organization to promote citizen-based efforts for neighborhood improvement. Any resident, business owner, employee, property owner or member of an existing neighborhood group within a Neighborhood Council area can join a Neighborhood Council.

The Tacoma Municipal Code establishes the Neighborhood Council program (Chapter 1.45 of the Tacoma Municipal Code). The TMC stipulates that:

- The purpose is "to establish policies in support of neighborhood involvement in the deliberations and actions of City government through a Neighborhood Council Program,"(1.45.010 Purpose.)
- "It is the intent of the City to engage its neighborhoods as broadly as possible in the issues and concerns that directly affect them. The City will support and promote a Neighborhood Council Program to foster open communication between the City and its neighborhoods and to create an environment in which residents are afforded an opportunity to participate in City government decisions in an advisory role."(1.45.020 Intent.)
- Neighborhood Councils will serve in an advisory capacity to City government on matters concerning the general health, safety, and welfare of their neighborhoods. (1.45.040 Neighborhood Council functions and responsibilities.)

In response to the Purpose, Intent, and Responsibility, the neighborhood citizens are required to create and develop the substance of this program through their own activities.

Subordinate to the TMC, "the Neighborhood Council Program Standards and Guidelines ″ (December 17, 2019) was described for the operation of the Neighborhood Council program:

- ・Neighborhood Council must prepare a Bylaw that includes the following：record with the City which include a description of the governance structure and decision making mechanisms employed by the Neighborhood Council； provisions stating terms limits for years of service； a process for internal mediation of conflicts and a method of addressing community complaints； election process.
- ・"resources may be available to the Neighborhood Councils through the City or other source. Neighborhood and Community Services may provide opportunities for operational funding to Neighborhood Councils and will make a good faith effort to publicize the availability of various public grants".
- ・Neighborhood Councils will develop an Annual Report, Annual Action Plan and Budget.

While we have looked at the program of the Neighborhood Council from the TMC and Standards and Guidelines, the legal basis and structure of Neighborhood Councils derived (Table 2). In particular, NC has a strong relationship with the municipalities in the form of advocacy, consultation, funding of operation costs, and formulation and submission of annual plans.

In terms of organizational ontological view, Neighborhood Coiucil is recognized as a another Formalized Community Organization of which function and context are differ from the RC ones.

Table2 Legal Basis and Structure of Neighborhood Council

local government in charge of	City government (general purpose government)
legal basis	Municipal Code/ ordinance
structure	the program that is established by the city government; neighborhood citizen's activity fill the substantial development
establishment process	vote
budget	operational funding to neighborhood councils from city government
connecting to other program	community development-related grants ("Innovative Grant")

3.2 Issues and Resources of Neighborhood Council -from the interview research

The issues that Neighborhood Councils are facing will be clarified through an interview with the Neighborhood Council staff in Tacoma.

As a result of the interview with the charged-staff of The City of Tacoma[11], the following points were revealed. She provided from perspectives of the Neighborhood Council and the City:

①It is very difficult to get involved in "neighborhood issue to put into the city". Especially when some matters are related to specific issues that involves developers, which are handled by average civic leaders, but it often takes a long time to resolve specialized matters.

②One of the challenges is to serve as a leader for a long period of time. For example, if one person serves on the board for 20 years, there is a problem of not having enough diversity in the board members of NC.

③There are various active associations within the Neighborhood Council's jurisdiction, but these associations often are not connected to the Neighborhood Council. In other words, the question is whether NCs are able to be hubs in their own jurisdictions.

④There are many social problems such as

homelessness, prostitution issues, crime deterrence issues, public safety issues, etc., but often we hear about these issues not from the Neighborhood Council, but from individual people or other groups.

What the above points illustrate is a different context than the RCs mentioned above. In other words, the NC is expected to be a counterpart of the city government, and the question is to what extent it can function in relation to it (① and ④). In addition, NCs are expected to serve a wide range withing each jurisdiction and the question is whether they can be a "hub of cooperation" in this context. In addition, the issue of the NC aging/not-diversifying was raised ②).

From a bird's eye view, we are being asked that NC could be the counterparts of the municipalities and to be "real" as representatives of the region（Table 3）.

Here, it was confirmed that both of them have one thing in common: they are established or promoted by the government.

At the same time, it became clear that there is a difference in the context of the two councils, especially in terms of issues, whether they are expected to be umbrella councils for various groups and issues in their own jurisdictions (Neighborhood Council) or whether they are to closely look at the "way of life" of the residents of the PHA site (Resident Council): (Table 3).

4. Findings

The "new social risks" are increasing severely in the communities at the dramatically changing societies. From the fundamental question of how to sustain and resolve that from the perspective of community organization development, this paper explores two systems of community organizations formulated as "Formalized Community Organizations" in the United States.

In addition, keeping in mind the issue of overweighting quantitative analysis, which can easily lead to negative evaluations of the effectiveness of current strategies and projects, the research and

Table 3   Problems and Resources in Neighborhood Councils and Resident Councils

Problems

	Neighborhood Council (City)	Resident Council (PHA)
	· difficulty reltated to "neighborhood issue to put into the city" · NC aging/ not-diversifying; absense of leaders · associations often are not connected to the Neighborhood Council · not informationl bottom-up proseess through NC to tha city (←)	· absense of leaders; access to residents with leadership training or experience · tensions and or depleted trust between Residents and PHA staff/ leadership; misunderstanding between RC members and other residents · issues and relations between different social groups with competing agendas

Resourses

	· fnding to opetation fee · municipal code	· funding (TPF) · HUD regulation · Executive Directors of PHAs as/ from "Grassroots Community Revitalists"

analysis was conducted from the perspective of qualitative research, utilizing the expertise of each author.

1 ） We verified the inherent characteristics of "Formalized Community Organizations", and confirmation of the nuances between the institutional features of "Formalized Community Organizations" like the followings:

- ●As Formalized Community Organizations, ① they are established or encouraged to be established by the government (city government; PHA as special purpose governments) on a legal basis, ②they are allowed to receive subsidies from the government, and ③they are able to provide input into the policy and implementation of the government. ④Formalized Community Organization is guaranteed to provide input into policy and implementation.

- ●The mission of both organizations is to protect the public sphere as a "formal" organization.

- ●This is where the unique relationship between government and Formalized Community Organization differs from that of other community organizations.

- ●The difference between NCs and RCs in Formalized Community Organizations is that NCs have jurisdiction over all citizens of the district, and therefore NCs are expected to be responsive to all issues and groups that arise in the community (whether they can be the hub of the district organization or not), while RCs have jurisdiction over citizens living in PHA sites. On the other hand, RCs are limited in terms of area and human resources as they have jurisdiction over citizens living in PHA sites.

- ●Formalized Community Organizations have the aspect of symbolizing the substance of the "relationship between citizens and governors", so to speak, and governments pays attention to the maintenance of good relationship. In particular, the government will pay attention to the development of leaders who have a good understanding of citizens and government and can act accordingly.

- ●On the other hand, some leaders from grassroots activists are appearing in the government again. (Especially in the leaders who support PHA).

2 ） We tried an early introduction and understanding of the inherent purpose of each system and their actual relation to the actual welfare support situations in neighborhoods, as well as their relation to human service sector：

- ●Formalized Community Organizations are involved in resolving homelessness, unemployment, and public safety in each area, as their mission is to protect the public sphere as a "formal" organization. In the case of NC, it acts as a hub for organizations within the jurisdiction (such as support activities for homeless issues). In the case of RC, In the case of PHA, it supports the activities and deployment of PHA (ROSS).

- ●An abundance of data is yet to be collected before we can holistically analyze theses relationship to human services systems.

- ●In terms of welfare state policy/welfare regime, it is part of a trend that is not "welfare-to-work. This is especially true in the case of ROSS (PHA, RC), which is tailor-made job matching support for each resident. In terms of welfare state theory, from the perspective of Diamond's theory, this is a development that is progressing and has further potential.

We acquired these findings, through examining the

framework and related factors, In addition we also observed, thought partially, that in the drastically changing U.S. localities, against New Social Risks such as homelessness, unemployment, the Formalized Community Organizations (organization with "inherent characteristics as a government-backed and for protecting neighborhood public sphere") have their significant possibility of not being swallowed up by unilateral social policies (such as neo-liberal ones), in conjunction with the provision of flexible and resilient activities and social-services-delivery(such as ROSS service).

1 Ryan Allen and David Riper, Spring 2020, The New Deal, the Deserving Poor, and the First Public Housing Residents in New York City, *Social Science History* , Volume 44 , Issue 1 , pp. 91 - 115（DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/ssh.2019.41）

2 Lawrence L. Thompson, 2006, A History of HUD（DOI: https://monarchhousing.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/03/hud-history.pdf）

3 Public Housing History, October 17, 2019. National Low Income Housing Coalition.（DOI: https://nlihc.org/resource/public-housing-history）

4 Though the full story of the journey and hurdles of the Public Housing program's implementation and impact is rich and stimulating, the goal of this section is to offer but a brief historical introduction to the program and allow more time to share its basic mechanics in its relation to its contemporary, HUD's Housing Choice Voucher program. To gain a more robust yet succinct understanding of the program, we highly recommend reading Alex. Schwartz, A.F, 2006, *Housing policy in the United States :An introduction,* Routledge

5 HUD Public and Indian Housing, HCV Dashboard. (2021)（DOI: https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_ indian_housing/programs/hcv/dashboard）

6 Jacqueline Molinaro-Thompson, 1991, *Community Empowerment: A Guide to Building Strong Resident Councils,* Pittsburg HUD Office.

7 PIH Notice 2001-3 (HA). January 2001.

8 Tenant Participation and Management in Public Housing Projects (24 CFR 964). Housing Development Reporter. 30:3351, RF-542, 10-17,94.

9 URBANIST (August 26, 2016), Seattle To Cut Official Ties With Neighborhood District Councils (https://www.theurbanist.org/2016/08/26/seattle-to-cut-official-ties-with-neighborhood-district-councils/)

10 Tacoma's eight Neighborhood Council boundaries – in Northeast Tacoma, New Tacoma, the North End, the West End, Central Tacoma, South Tacoma, the Eastside and the South End.

11 Informant: Ms. Carol Wolfe, Economic Development Supervisor, The City of Tacoma Place: The municipal building of the City of Tacoma Time: 14 September, 2016

Bibliography

・Berry et al.,1993, *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*, Brookings

・Chenault, Tiffany,2015, *The unseen politics of public housing: resident councils, communities, and change,* Lexington Books

・The City of Tacoma, Neighborhood Council Program Standards and Guidelines (December 17, 2019)

・Cnaan, R. A., & Milofsky, C. (eds.), 2018, *Handbook of Community Movements and Local Organizations in the 21st Century*, Springer International Publishing

・Cooper,T., and Pradeep Chandra Kathi,2005, Neighborhood Councils and City Agencies: A Model of Collaborative Action, *National Civic Review* 94(1)

・Esping-Andersen, G., 1990, *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Princeton University Press

・Hallman, Howard W.,1977, *The Organization and*

Operation of Neighborhood Councils. A Practical Guide, Praeger Publishers

・Jeffery R. Hening,1994, *American Political Science Review*,88

・Jenson,J.,2015,Social innovation: redesigning the welfare diamond, in: Nicholls, A.(eds.),*New frontiers in social innovation research,* Palgrave Macmillan

・Kotler, Milton.,1969, *Neighborhood government: The local foundations of political life*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill

・Maeyama, Soichiro, 2020, *The Role of Special Purpose Governments in Localities in the United States – Small Governments driven by Citizen-Engagement for Sustaining Dynamics of Housing-, Human-services -*, Toshindo Publishing.

・O'Grady, Timothy ,2019, *Community Planning in 21st Century Los Angeles: Assessing the Effectiveness of LA's Neighborhood Council System* (Thesis Columbia University)

・Radford, Gail, 2013, *The Rise of the Public Authority. State building and Economic Development in Twentieth-Century America*, The University of Chicago Press

・Schwartz, A.F,2006, *Housing policy in the United States: An introduction*, Routledge

・University of Washington,2018, Livable City Year 2017-2018 in Partnership with the City of Tacoma

「公式化されたコミュニティ組織」の制約と可能性
－米国諸都市における「ネイバーフッドカウンシル」と
ハウジングオーソリティの「レジデントカウンシル」の質的分析－

前 山 総一郎　　　　デュラン・オスカー

要旨

　激変する地域社会において「新たな社会的リスク」が進展し,「福祉から労働へ」の公共政策が強まる中で,私たちの文明は,より効果的なコミュニティ組織のシステムを開発する観点から,なにが可能なのだろうか？定量的な分析の課題を踏まえて,筆者らは,グローバル・コミュニティとして,このような推進戦略の分析をどのように始めるべきかについて,新鮮なアプローチを提示している。

　この研究で筆者らは,米国の地方自治体の設置による,ユニークな組織である「公式化されたコミュニティ組織」(Formalized Community Organizations)の枠組みを探る。筆者たちは,インタビューと「実践者の考察」を通じて,その構成と,それに伴う様々な問題を探った。その際,日米のネイバーフッドカウンシルのシステム（Neighborhood Council：NC）（前山）と米国のレジデントカウンシル（Resident Council：RC）のシステム（デュラン)についての,それぞれの専門的知見が活用された。

　この2つのシステムの枠組みと課題を質的に検討した結果,以下の知見を得た：第一に,これら二つ（NCとRC)の「公式化されたコミュニティ組織」の制度的特徴（法的根拠,政府からの補助金,諮問機関としての権限,組織の使命)の間のニュアンスを確認した。第二に,それぞれのシステムの本来の目的と,その,地区での実際の福祉支援状況との関係性,また福祉サービス部門とのその関係性について,初期的に描出が試みられた。第三に,その分析の精緻化のためにさらに多面的なデータの収集が求められる。