

COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

CLASS PROJECT:  
LECLAIRE/HEARST PARK EXPANSION  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JOANN WILLIAMS

PROF. DAVID MILLER  
INSTRUCTOR

Joann Williams  
4631 S. Lamon St.  
Chicago, IL 60638  
(312) 284-7480

January 21, 1994

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	TITLE	PAGE
I.	Executive Summary	A
II.	Problem Definition Outline:	B
	History Project Analysis of Causes	
	Narrative	1-5
III.	Project Goals	C
IV.	Methods	D
	Narrative	6
V.	Root Causes of & Improvements made to address the Problem	E
VI.	Results	F
VII.	Analysis	G
	Narrative	7-9
VIII.	Exhibits:	10
	Executive Summary - Feasibility Study, 1991	11-12
	Samples - Key Correspondence	13-22
	Newspaper Articles CPD Mismanagement	23-26
	Newspaper Bids for Contractor Solicitation	27-28
	Current Design Sketch - Leclaire/Hearst Park Narrative	29-31
	Proposed Concept Sketch - Leclaire/Hearst Park Narrative	32-34
	New Building Concept:	35
	First Floor - Floor Plan	36
	Second Floor - Floor Plan	37
	Basic Sketch, Swimming Pool and Gym/Theatre	38-39

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE CED PROJECT  
1992/93**

This project consists of a four year effort to acquire funding to promote facilitation/expansion of the Leclaire/Hearst Park Community Center. This park is located on the far Southwest side of Chicago near Midway Airport. The community is the Leclaire/Hearst Community which is a low to moderate income minority community, consisting of residents in Leclaire Courts public housing development and private homeowners referred to as the Hearst Community.

The expansion of the park consists of two phases. Phase I consists of increasing the land space (1.73) acres by incorporating 3 vacant lots directly across the street from the current park facility. The community is responsible for monitoring all activities of the land acquisition through to and including ground breaking. Phase II consists of acquiring funds to build an expanded park building facility. The new facility will include a swimming pool, exercise weight room, computer room, and multi-purpose gym. The multi-purpose gym will allow for a theatre, roller rink, and removable boxing ring. A small reference library (the community has no library in the immediate area); a computer room, and a community room are also planned.

The goals of the project were to:

1. Follow-up on Phase I activities.
2. Provide Community Input to construction planning concept.
3. Review Bidders List for contract construction
4. Examine "Blue Prints" and construction specifications.
5. Facilitate Ground Breaking.
6. Begin Phase II Activities - New Building Construction Concepts and locate potential funders (On-Going).

All goals have been met with the exception of one. Due to Chicago Park District (CPD) placing a "FREEZE" on all construction projects, we experienced a set-back in ground breaking activities. However, a new ground breaking date is tentatively scheduled for June, 1994.

As of January, 1994, we may need to repeat our steps or project goals due to the CPD freeze. In short, we will repeat our project goals listed above, once again, in 1994. However, the community learned patience and determination. We will see this project through completion and "Keep Our Eyes On The Prize"!

This project has been a truly rewarding experience for me as well as residents in the community. The efforts put forth in this project will be replicated in other areas to address community issues such as: economic development, job creation, social/human services planning, educational/vocational job training assistance, etc.

## PROBLEM DEFINITION

### HISTORY:

LOCATION - LECLAIRE / HEARST PARK

PETITIONS BY YOUTHS AGES: 16-21

CDBG FUNDS

FEASIBILITY STUDY - PHASE I LANDSCAPE EXPANSION

### PROJECT:

FOLLOW UP / FOLLOW-THROUGH PHASE I ACTIVITIES

COMMUNITY IN-PUT

FACILITATE GROUND BREAKING

BEGIN PHASE II ACTIVITIES - NEW BUILDING EXPANSION

LOCATE POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR BUILDING

### ANALYSIS OF CAUSES:

LACK OF COMMUNITY IN-PUT ORIGINAL PARK DESIGN 1974

UNANTICIPATED INCREASE IN YOUTH POPULATION

LACK OF YOUTH INVOLVEMENT IN ORIGINAL PLANNING

CPD LACK OF SENSITIVITY - COMMUNITY NEEDS

# HISTORY

## Location-Leclaire / Hearst Park:

The Leclaire/Hearst neighborhood is located on the far Southwest side, near Midway Airport in the predominantly White ethnic Garfield Ridge Community of Chicago. Leclaire/Hearst is a small, isolated, predominantly Black neighborhood which consists of residents of Leclaire Courts, Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) Public Housing and black homeowners referred to as the Hearst neighborhood. They are jointly referred to as the Leclaire/Hearst Community. Total population is 7,500 residents, with both having approximately 3,500 residents each.

## Petition By Youths ages: 16-21:

In 1988, a petition by area youths of the Clarence Darrow Family Resource Center, Leclaire/Hearst Youth Steering Committee, was generated to request additional park recreation and social activities to the Chicago Park District (CPD). After many meetings and discussions between CPD staff and community leaders, it was determined that our park was too small to accommodate the programs and activities discussed and listed on the petition. This petition, which generated 1,000 area resident signatures, prompted interest by community leaders to answer questions on how our park (Leclaire/Hearst Park Community Center) could address the increased demand for family and youth activities in our community.

## Community Development Block Grant CDBG Funds:

A Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Year XVI, proposal was submitted in 1989. This proposal requested funding in the amount of \$19,000 to conduct a feasibility study to expand our park. The expansion activities would include the park building itself and additional land to expand our park in-door and out-door recreational activities. The proposal was approved and funding began in January, 1990. The Feasibility Study was completed in May, 1991. (See Exhibit 12 Executive Summary, Feasibility Study.)

# PROJECT

## Follow up /Follow-Through Phase I Activities:

In 1991, the feasibility study proved implimentable. The CPD became interested in the results of the feasibility study and upon review of the final report, allocated \$300,000 in its FY 91-92 budget for the landscape acquisition of three vacant lots located directly across the street from the park fieldhouse building. This 1.72 additional acres would be used to expand the out-door landscape of the park and include one additional Playlot (Playgrounds) for children eight to twelve and the relocation of our current "Tot Lot" playground.

Transfer of the additional lots (1.72 acres) occurred in January, 1992 at NO COST to the Chicago Park District. This "Free Transfer" of property occurred as a result of community lobbying to the Chicago City Council, the governing body of Chicago, and the Chicago Board of Education (CBE) who was the legal owners of the three vacant lots at that time.

In 1992, the State of Illinois, Department of Conservation (SIDC) located in the State Capital of Springfield, Illinois, became interested in the park expansion plans. As a result of the feasibility study, Joann Williams, Project Director of the Park Expansion Plan Feasibility Study and Rita McClennon, Director of External Park Funding, CPD were requested to go to Springfield to speak before the SIDC hearing committee. They jointly prepared a proposal to SIDC and spoke in favor of receiving state funding for the Leclaire/Hearst Park Expansion Project.

The SIDC proposal was accepted with the stipulation that the Chicago Park District (CPD) provide a 2 to 1 match in funding. In 1993, the CPD agreed to the match and the state granted \$244,000 to expansion project. The CPD allocated funding from its 1992/93 budget in the amount of \$200,000. This match was in addition to the original \$300,000 allocated in the FY 91/92 Budget bringing the total for the entire landscape expansion to \$744,000.

### Community In-Put:

In 1993, the community provided in-put through meetings with park staff, phone calls and letters in support of the project. Several minor changes occurred in the original concept drawings contained in the Feasibility Study. Two of the changes provided for a 300 yard "DASH" track instead of a running track and an out-door volleyball court. The community monitored all changes and recommendations presented by the CPD.

A final concept drawing plan was presented to the community and was accepted. The final plan provided that one vacant lot, directly across the street from the current field house building be set aside for the construction of a two-story expanded in-door recreation/community activities facility.

### Facilitate Ground Breaking:

Construction Blue Prints and Landscape Surveys took place during the year in 1993. In August, 1993, the Blue Prints were completed and Contract Bids solicitation was issued for expansion construction to begin. Bids were opened on September 7, 1993. The community was planning to have "Ground Breaking Ceremonies" on or near October 15, 1993. (See Exhibit 28 Bid Ad.)

### A MAJOR SNAG OCCURRED:

The CPD Superintendent of Parks and Recreation resigned. The new Superintendent, appointed by the Mayor of Chicago, placed a "FREEZE" on ALL renovation and construction projects. Needless to say, our project was included. Local newspapers and T.V. stories painted a bleak picture of park fiscal irresponsibility. Due to a small group of union park workers overstepping their boundaries and abilities, it seemed that the park was 10 million dollars in debt! See Exhibits 24 25 26 News Articles.

### SUMMARY OF THE PARK FISCAL PROBLEMS:

Between 1988 and 1990 the park allocated funding to rehabilitate park playgrounds. The rehabilitation was a court mandate called the "Consent Decree". CPD had been found by the court, guilty of several issues to include discrimination of park services and facilities in minority areas, unsafe condition of playgrounds, etc. The CPD was required by law, under the Consent Decree, to take corrective action. Part of the corrective action

was to construct "Safe" playgrounds for small children. There had been several law suits filed against the CPD over the past ten years, whereby children experienced crippling injuries (including major spinal and head injuries) due to out-dated playground equipment and hard concrete surfaces. The "Tot Lot" Soft Surface Restoration Project Began and \$2 Million Dollars was allocated to reconstruct playlots. The old concrete surfaces were replaced by "Woodchips" and granulated rubber pebbles to reduce major injury to children. Also, more "user friendly" playground equipment replaced old out-dated (1950's) equipment.

It appeared that a \$2 million dollar project expanded into a \$10 million dollar project by means of park personnel creating their own CPD Internal Capital Improvement/Construction Department. This was totally illegal and park craft personnel were neither equipped nor had the experience to perform major rehab and construction work. As a result of this, cost over runs for construction and rehabilitation projects ran amuck. A FREEZE on all projects resulted with the new Superintendent subsequently evaluating each and every renovation, rehab and construction project within the Chicago park system. Our expansion project was caught up in the fiscal SNAFU -- Situation Normal All F...ed Up! (In case you were wondering, THAT'S "FOULED UP". However, you can replace the three letters to the word which better fits the situation.)

In November, the week of Thanksgiving, we were verbally informed that our project would proceed. In December, we received confirmation in writing by the CPD that our project was included for completion. However, by this time, all bids submitted were null and void. The bid proposals were good for only 75 days. Mind you, this was the holiday season and nothing much will get done until the beginning of 1994.

Ground Breaking has been rescheduled for Spring, 1994.

### Begin Phase II Activities - New Building Expansion:

Through all of the confusion, the community managed to stand fast and keep focused. A student architect provided pro-bono sketching of what we would like see in a new building expansion. See Exhibits 35-39.

The new building expansion would include space for an in-door swimming pool, a recreation center for expanded activities such as a multi-purpose gym for a roller rink, theatre and collapsible boxing ring. Also included would be space for computer literacy training, GED, mini library, community meeting room, dance room, nautilus equipped exercise room, sauna and family counseling room.

### Locate Potential Funding Sources For New Building Expansion:

We have located two potential funding sources. (I prefer not to use their names at the present time. They are major foundations who are not yet totally willing to commit funds until Phase I is near completion. I understand their concerns due to the CPD "turbulence" over the past year.) However, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is interested in contributing to such a recreation facility. This initiative is part of HUDs desire to provide recreational opportunities to low-income families. Since recreation can be used as an alternative to gangs, drugs and negative youth activities, it is only natural to for HUD to provide resources in this area.

## **ANALYSIS OF CAUSES:**

### **Lack of Community In Put Original Park Design 1974:**

Residents in the Leclaire/Hearst Community fought over 6 years to have a park built in the community from 1968 to 1974. In 1970, the Hearst Community was still majority White. "White Flight" occurred between 1970-1972. Since those truly spear heading the fight were Black residents in Leclaire Courts public housing, not much consideration was given to build a new park. A few homeowners in Hearst who were, at that time, majority White, joined their fight in 1970 and park construction became a reality in 1973 and 1974.

However, the Chicago Park District (CPD) provided a simple, inexpensive "Boiler Plate" design for Leclaire/Hearst Park. The community did not examine the "Blue Prints" or construction designs and material requirements. Nor did they anticipate future uses for the park, increased demand for recreational services, or a large increase in the Black youth population in the Leclaire/Hearst Communities. Whites in Hearst were just plain glad to see that Blacks no longer had to come into what they perceived as "Their" park, Vittum Park, eight blocks south of Leclaire Courts. Blacks in Hearst and Leclaire were just happy for a park, ANY PARK to be constructed in the community.

There was no community in-put on park field house construction. The building itself was considered "Modern" for its time and our park is considered an "infant" compared to other parks in Chicago which are well over 100 years old. The "European" model was used in the older parks, which have duck and fishing ponds, boating, swimming pools, huge oak trees, biking and walking paths, gazebos, rectories, huge gothic greek styled columned architectural structures, flower gardens, horse back riding paths, historic monuments and sculpted/carved statues etc.

Leclaire/Hearst Park is plain, modern and urban. It has an out-door basketball court, a tennis court, two baseball diamonds, a "Tot Lot" Playground (discussed earlier) and a Veterans Memorial (constructed by yours truly and other community veterans). The Field House has a gymnasium (which represents 80% of the field house interior space), four small activity rooms which includes a woodshop, locker and shower rooms, two bathrooms, one storage room, a small kitchen and three very small offices (one office is really closet space).

Park activities for youths are still in the 1960's. The more affluent parks have modern activities however, by and large, most parks have checkers and ping pong. Some parks including Leclaire have chess games, track and field, touch foot ball, a struggling little league, and of course BASKETBALL. It seems every young man wants to be "Michael Jordan" of the Chicago Bulls. Due to the Gym occupying 80% of park space, this is the primary activity available at the Field House. Also, the park supervisor is a former "Harlem Globe Trotter", therefore BASKETBALL is the primary activity emphasized at Leclaire/Hearst Park. Most recently, the Chicago Housing Authority (public housing) has a Midnight Basketball League in which Leclaire Courts now has a team.

Needless to say, it takes more than Basketball to make a community thrive. This is the reason youths in the community launched their petition drive in 1988. Leclaire Park must step into the 90s and beyond. There are so many problems in poor communities which requires community action and in-put. The park is one solution. However, the initial planners of our park design did not take into consideration future community needs in 1974. Nor did they think in terms of the need for growth and expansion of park programs and services. Twenty years later, we are attempting to address recreation, education and social needs within our community. Even the new Superintendent agrees.



### Unanticipated Increase in Youth Population:

According to the 1980 census, Leclaire/Hearst community had a 56% youthful population, i.e. age ranging between 16 and 24. (In 1970 youth represented 30% of the population, combined ages 1-24.) The 1990 census reflects 46% youth between the ages of 16-24 with an increase of 10% of children below this youth age range. In short, younger children are being born and the "Older Youth" of the 1980s have remained in the community and are having these children who are now approximately 7-13 years of age. Less than half received their high school diploma. Many grand and great grand parents in the community are now taking on responsibility for rearing young children. This may be due to the fact that so many of our youths are having children and abandoning them to grand and great grand parents because of drug addiction. I am not a "Spin Doctor", however, the realities of what is happening in our community must be analyzed to make a projection for program services. This is not only for park programs and services, but also, social/human services programs in general.

### Lack of Youth Involvement in Original Planning:

It appears that the youth who generated the 1988 petition to increase park activities and service were right on target. The number of young people receiving a high school diploma dropped significantly and to have offered a GED class would have been very helpful. Teen pregnancies is also a problem and now we are seeing the result of chemically dependent parent's children. More pre-school and kindergarden aged children are considered educationally mentally handicapped (EMH). Child abuse is on the increase, lack of jobs and or skills training program, etc. A Family Counseling program is definately needed in order to support existing social service programs. I am truly impressed with the foresight of the youths who generated the 1988 petition who now range between the ages of 22-27. We really should listen to youths.

Although the initial advocates to build the park originally in 1974 could not envision the drug epidemic, gangs, teen pregnancies, illiteracy, increased drop out rate, computer technology etc., they could have been more sensitive to the desires of youths. The initial park advocates and park officials did not even consider youth involvement in planning for the original construction of our park. I believe this was a grave mistake. Since the goal is to provide recreation and other services for our youth, their views and opinions were critical.

I believe we have addressed the issue of youth involvement. Youth and youth advocates were included in all phases of planning for Phase I and the beginning stages for Phase II, new expanded building facility construction. Their in-put for park activities, educational, social and recreational programming is deemed essential.

### CPD Lack of Sensitivity to Community Needs:

The Chicago Park District (CPD) had very little sensitivity to the needs and desires of residents in Leclaire/Hearst. All activities were TOP-DOWN Planning. The "Boiler Plate", off the shelf design for our park was totally insensitive. The community leaders, I believe, merely wanted a PARK so anything the park gave them was acceptable. The park officials nor the community leadership took under consideration the changes occurring in both the Leclaire and Hearst Communities. There was an increase in AFDC single parent households occurring in Leclaire and there was an increase in the number of Black families replacing White families in Hearst. On the average, Black families have more children than White families. We believe we have addressed historic problems and are constantly evaluating/projecting future demographic concerns and programming in our current and on future planning.

## PROJECT GOALS:

FOLLOW-UP / FOLLOW THROUGH PHASE I LANDSCAPE EXPANSION

OBTAIN FUNDS COMMITMENT - ILL. DEPT. OF CONSERVATION  
\$244,000.00

PARK DISTRICT DOUBLE STATE FUND MATCH, MIN. \$500,000.

TOTAL PROJECT LANDSCAPE EXPANSION: \$744,000.00

## COMMUNITY IN-PUT:

SURVEY SCHEDULES / BLUE PRINT -SPECS. / BID LIST

SCHEDULE GROUND BREAKING ACTIVITIES (ON HOLD)

BEGIN BASIC CONCEPTS FOR PHASE II NEW BUILDING

## Funding Sources for New Building Expansion Identified:

1. State of Illinois ( Parks, Forestry, Recreation & Youths)
2. Federal Sources (HUD)
3. 2 Major Foundations - Matching Funds

## Estimated Cost of New Expanded Building Facility :

1.3 Million

## METHODS

### COMMUNITY MEETINGS:

1. Residents
2. Park Officials
3. City Officials

### OTHER ACTIVITIES:

4. Resident Phone Calls
5. Letters / Petitions
6. Lobbying

### MONITORING BY COMMUNITY - PROJECT OVERSIGHT:

Request CPD Time Schedules For :

Land Surveys

Design Changes from Original Concept

Youth Participation in Landscape Changes

Copies of Blue Prints / Engineering Specs.

Copies of CPD Contractor's Bidders List

Dates when Bid Solicitation will begin for Project

Date when Bids will be opened for public inspection

Review by Community of all Bids on the Project.

Feed Back to CPD Board of Commissioners, Contract Div. on Contractor Selection

## METHODS

The primary methods used to facilitate this project were community meetings, phone calls (a few hundred) and attendance of monthly CPD Commissioner's Meetings.

Ensure that park officials and city officials (i.e. area city council member) be aware of our concerns. Monitor any activities or meetings held between leaders, i.e. Park Superintendent and Alderman. Provide feed back to the community.

Attached is a list of community representation at meetings.

1. Leclaire Resident Management Corporation
2. Hearst Community Organization (Homeowner's Association)
3. Principal, Hearst Elementary School
4. Chairperson, Hearst School Local School Council
5. Executive Director, Leclaire/Hearst Community Center  
(formerly Clarence Darrow Community Center)
6. Alderman Munoz 22 Ward
7. 22nd & 23rd Ward Democratic Ward Organization Representative
8. Leclaire/Hearst Youth Steering Committee.
9. Leclaire/Hearst Park Supervisor and Host Area Parks Manager.
10. Director, Leclaire/Hearst Family Resource Center.  
Teen and Adolescent Counseling Services.
11. Commander, 8th District, Chicago Police Department
12. President, Leclaire/Hearst Park Local Advisory Council
13. Chicago Park District, External Affairs - and CPD Staff.
14. City of Chicago Department of Economic Development &  
Planning.
15. Pitman Contractors - Blue Print Intrepretation - Pro-Bono.

There was periodic representation from Leclaire Baptist Church, the Salvation Army, Business Owner, Lula Gay Simmons.

Note: Not every one was able to attend ALL THE TIME. However, they were kept informed as to the status of the project.

ROOT CAUSES OF  
PROBLEM 1974

Lack of Community In-Put

Lack of Youth Involvement

Lack of Future Vision by CPD

Lack of Sensitivity by CPD

IMPROVEMENTS  
1994

Constant Community In-Put

Youth Involvement

Community Provides Vision

CPD made aware of our needs

## RESULTS

PHASE I FOLLOW-UP	ACCOMPLISHED
FUNDING FOR LANDSCAPE REDESIGN/EXPANSION	ACCOMPLISHED
COMMUNITY IN-PUT	ACCOMPLISHED
FUNDING SOURCES FOR NEW BUILDING IDENTIFIED	PARTIALLY COMPLETE ON-GOING
GROUND BREAKING	RESCHEDULED FOR SPRING 1994

## ANALYSIS

What was learned:

1. P A T I E N C E !
2. Organized Community Participation - Effectiveness
3. Duplication of Activities in Other Areas.
4. Collaboration and Consensus Building can be Hazardous to your Health
5. Listen to youths - they might surprise you with concrete solutions to problems .
6. The community has the resources to solve problems

## NEXT STEP

START ALL OVER AGAIN FROM SQUARE  
ONE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN  
EXPANDED NEW BUILDING FACILITY !

HERE WE GO AGAIN!!!

## ANALYSIS

1. Patience is essential. This was the case for me as well as the community. People want things to occur overnight. This has been a long process. The set-backs may have caused some to lose a bit of faith. (This includes me!) However, things are back on track even though we will have to repeat the community review on the METHODS for community in-put during the April, 1994, solicitation for bids. The FREEZE on construction projects with the resulting time-lapse for bids through everyone through a loop. However, our experience has taught us, through the steps outlined under METHODS, we can do it and will do it again. Patience!!

2. Duplication of Organizing Activities on Other Community Issues. We have learned that organized community participation at the Grass Roots level can be effective. The lessons taught through this entire park expansion process can be replicated to address other community issues such as: Affordable Housing Construction, Economic Development, City Services, Gang Activity, Political Organizing, Social Service Program Development, etc.

One lesson learned already by this group was that the community can have control. Last year, a merchant wanted to open a liquor store in the community. The community organized. We launched a complaint form drive which caused the city Liquor Licensing Commissioner to call a hearing to determine whether a liquor license should be granted in our community. After twenty-five residents appeared before the three member panel of the Liquor License Board of Commissioners, they unanimously voted and recommended to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner that No License be granted in our community. The community subsequently organized, generated petitions, placed a referendum on the November, 1993 Ballot and VOTED THE AREA DRY. No Liquor License can be issued in the Leclair/Hearst Community. It was the same group of concerned community residents who are working on the park expansion project who spearheaded this community issue.

I believe when people finally realize they have the power, this inspires them to do more in and for their communities. FEEL THE POWER!

4. Collaboration and Consensus Building can be Hazardous to your Health. Organizing people is a challenging endeavor. There are many fractions in any community who want to be heard, have ideas (some rather bazaar), have other political aspirations, and others who are a general pain in the A\_\_ for no reason known to you. However, they all must feel that they are active participants in the process. I have left meetings with many headaches, backaches, stomach problems and in dire need for a drink! Facilitation is a true "Give-and-Take" activity.



5. Listen to Youths - they might surprise you with concrete solutions to problems in which THEY are effected. As stated previously, no one talked to young people in 1970s when construction of a new park was a community topic. I was approximately 16 years old myself. I was also community minded and would have gladly given my two cents of advice.

I realized , at 16 years of age, that since our community center (Constructed in 1951 as part of Leclaire Courts) had been turned into a "Day Care Center", there was no recreational outlet for younger people in the community. As young teenagers, adults in Leclaire sponsored weekly dances for us called "CANTEEN". This was a great experience for youth aged 13-19. The Clarence Darrow Community Center as it was called then, provided activities for youths. This included community plays, showing of Movies rented from the library (Pre Video Era), Field Trips, Summer Field Trips for young adults, etc. This social experience was cut-off with no replacement. The new field house under consideration in the early seventies could have been structured to replace our lost community center, and its activities. It could have also provided a social, recreational and educational outlet which was once the responsibility of the community center staff and purpose of the building. A Day Care Center was truly needed, however, community leaders seemed to think that the park would become the new community center. It did not and it wasn't planned to be since the community provided no in-put on park services, activities and programs. It was a PARK and the community base of the community center was lost to purely park programs and park bureacracy. A huge VOID in services and activities occurred to our youth. NOTE: The name of our park field house is The Leclaire/Hearst Park Community Center. Obviously the "community center" concept may have been the goal, however, it never truly occurred. The "Community Center" concept must be re-established for the sake of our youth. Listen to their recommendations, they are most aware of their problems and they sometimes have the answers and solutions.

6. The Community has the resources to solve its problems. However, as is the case with most people, the demands on each person's life causes weak community involvement. Most people are so drained due to day-to-day living, they don't have the energy to address overall community concerns. The Leclaire/Hearst Community has professionals, teachers, tradesmen, policemen etc. As a former resident in Leclaire, I can attest that many professional came from this low-income community. Although I have resided in Hearst since 1970, many of my school mates have moved on to become Doctors, Lawyers and other professionals. It's truly a shame that many of these professionals do not return and provide their talents and skills to re-build this community.

Regardless of the above problems, there are resources available to us if we reach out to get them. The talents, skills and networking capacity is impressive. Residents are beginning to utilize all available resources. People are willing to help address critical issues if they are involved and can see a positive outcome. I am proud of these individuals.

#### In Conclusion:

I would like to thank my fellow CED project group members for providing their insight on this project. Professor David Miller for his review, helpful observations and encouragement during this class project. Most importantly, I want to thank the community residents (Adults and Youths) who took the time to provide their input to the project. Without their help, we would never have come this far.

This project has been rewarding to me throughout the years. Frustrating YES, nerve racking, YES. However, it is not yet over and I do plan to provide an addendum to this report.

The ground breaking ceremonies will be the plateau of the project and, the construction of the expanded building facility will be the true end to this project. I can only advise any reader of this report to "Stay Tuned". It ain't over yet. I am sure that I will have more exciting experiences to share in 1994.