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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates how the process, politics, and impacts of culturally-framed redevelopment balance growth and equity within inner-city neighborhoods experiencing change. Redevelopment programs that draw upon existing arts and cultural assets have been supported and identified by planners as a strategy of local economic development (Stern & Seifert, 2007; Wherry, 2011). However, critiques of cultural preservation as a form of economic development argue that the norms and goals of such planning efforts and their impact on existing residents require further evaluation. For example, planning scholars find that cultural preservation may reinforce both existing spatial divides and forms of social exclusion (Grams, 2010; Zukin, 2010). At the same time, the recognition of ethnic and minority heritage by non-local forces has been identified by some scholars as an opportunity to further the multicultural transformation of public history as well as locally sustainable community development that benefits the neighborhood’s original inhabitants (Hurley, 2010; Lin, 2010).

I employ an extended case study research design and ethnographic methods to analyze how the process of producing authenticity contributes or impinges on development and market potential as well as social preservation efforts in a historic African American neighborhood,
U Street/Shaw, within Washington, DC. An analysis of the implementation of the guiding vision for the neighborhood’s cultural redevelopment, *The DUKE Plan*, occurs on three scales: neighborhood, anchor institutions, and individual (residents and visitors). Pro-growth strategies that bolstered the marketable “Black Broadway” place brand were supported at each scale rather than opportunities to preserve the neighborhood’s identity through the retention of long-term residents and interpretation of the breadth of the community’s identity. As a result of culturally-framed redevelopment, the U Street/Shaw neighborhood continues to gentrify causing a loss of belonging and ownership of cultural heritage among long-term residents. Solutions to ensuring that social equity provisions are delivered in culturally-framed redevelopment requires the adoption of accountability measures defined by existing residents during the planning process that commercial and government stakeholders must continually adhere to throughout and after implementation.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A five-foot tall sign stands amidst a clustering of multicolored newspaper and real estate pamphlet stands on the corner of 14th and U Streets, NW in Washington, DC. The sign is passed daily by people going to and from the Frank D. Reeves Municipal Center, a modern structure built in 1986 as part of then-Mayor Marion Barry’s initiative to revitalize the neighborhood (Levey, 2010). This refined sign features black text set in front of comforting hues of brown and tan accompanied by black and white photographs describing the events of the violent riots of 1968 that plagued the city for three days following the assassination of Martin Luther, King, Jr. These two objects—the sign that is the last stop on the Greater U Street Heritage Trail and the municipal center—would seem to be completely disconnected in time and space. One recognizes a traumatic past event while the other was intended to mark the promising economic future of the neighborhood. However, there is a direct relationship between these two objects. Both were used as tools to signal the redevelopment of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood.

The corner of 14th and U was a gathering place throughout the neighborhood’s history. The daily life, public events, and spontaneous moments that have unfolded at this corner are both ordinary and extraordinary. Prior to 1920, Washington, DC hosted the largest African American urban population in the United States with the U Street/Shaw neighborhood serving as its epicenter. Residents and workers lined up at the corner of 14th and U to transfer streetcars during their daily commutes. In the 1930s, New Negro Alliance picketers gathered at the corner to protest local business hiring discrimination (Smith, 2001). A little over 30 years later, a large group of protesters and mourners would gather again at the corner in the wake of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s assassination turning quickly into the riot that destroyed many of the neighborhood’s homes and businesses (Ruble, 2010).
In the years that followed the corner lay fallow, a signal of inner-city decline ranging from the influx of crack cocaine and its associated violence to unrelenting poverty (Jaffe & Sherwood, 1994). Desperate to gather investment interest in the neighborhood the Reeves Center was constructed by the city government under Mayor Marion Barry’s direction to “re-open” the corner as a place of business. Twenty-six years later, in 2012, I stood at that illustrious corner watching young urban professionals (yuppies) walk in pairs and small groups to Saturday brunch dates at the numerous Zagat-rated eateries in the community. Other residents were picking through the offerings at the 14th and U Farmers Market, rifling through tomatoes claiming to be “completely organic!, not hot-house!,” squash, breads, and artisanal goat cheeses offering “free samples!” In roughly the span of my lifetime the complexion of the neighborhood became paler, but still relatively heterogeneous as whites, blacks, Asians, and Hispanics continued to line up at the corner to catch a crosstown bus. At the same time, these different groups were separated from one another with mostly white residents perusing the farmer’s market and the majority of residents of color standing in line across the street to grab a bite at McDonald’s. The visual dichotomy suggested intermixing, but little intermingling of racial groups in the revitalized U Street/Shaw neighborhood.

Figure 1-1: 14th and U Farmers Market in August 2013. From: Author.
Contextualizing 14\textsuperscript{th} & U as “Every Corner, USA” and Study Significance

What dramatic change occurred to shift the trajectory of 14\textsuperscript{th} and U from its nadir in the 1970s to its current status as one of the city’s most popular neighborhood destinations for residents and tourists? The following work describes how the most positive aspects of the community’s history were leveraged to celebrate and market the neighborhood as a desirable destination for middle- to upper-middle income residents and tourists. In this way, U Street/Shaw, sometimes also referred to as Mid-City, serves as a case study similar to other inner-city neighborhood in the United States witnessing a rebirth through a combination of redevelopment and cultural preservation. The boundaries of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood are Massachusetts Avenue to the south, 7\textsuperscript{th} Street, NW to the east, Florida Avenue to the north, and 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, NW to the west. While the boundaries of the area were historically referred to as the Shaw neighborhood, recent development and branding tactics have delineated the area into three neighborhoods: U Street, Shaw and Logan Circle. U Street refers to the U Street corridor at the northern end of the neighborhood. Logan Circle refers to the area west of 12th Street, NW and south of P Street, NW (See Figure 3-1 below). The neighborhood is comprised of ten census tracts: 43, 44, 46, 48.01, 48.02, 49.01, 49.02, 50.01, 50.02, and 52.01 (U.S. Census, 2010).
Cities across the globe are employing a new style of redevelopment as a means to draw residents, businesses, and tourists back to the city. This study examines the form and function of culturally-framed redevelopment in the historic African American, inner-city neighborhood of U Street/Shaw in Washington, DC as outlined by The DUKE Plan—the City Council’s vision for the neighborhood adopted in 2005. Culturally-framed redevelopment is the strategic economic, public, and/or political support of a range of place-based activities that emphasize the production and consumption of the agreed-upon unique qualities and identity that exists within a particular spatial context such as a neighborhood, district, or city. Investments in place-based identity, culture and heritage are then used as a framing device in partnership with more traditional development interventions such as mixed-use development, infrastructure improvements, and increasing amenity provisions.
As a new iteration of inner-city renewal, culturally-framed redevelopment attempts to correct the failures and scars of past redevelopment efforts that razed neighborhoods and fractured social networks. Previous inner-city renewal strategies inserted economic growth tactics with little concern or regard to equitable distribution of development benefits. Moreover, redevelopment often led to displacement of long-term residents as higher-income earning residents moved to the neighborhood—a process known as gentrification (Thomas & Ritzdorf, 1997). Rather than bulldozing neighborhoods, this form of redevelopment attempts to balance economic growth with equity by identifying existing assets and attempting to preserve, recognize, and augment those assets as a means to improve the neighborhood. Growth strategies employed draw from traditional methods as mentioned above, but the innovation in culturally-framed redevelopment is the use of historic, cultural, and social preservation methods and the opportunity it presents to create long-lasting benefits for existing residents.

Authenticity, simply defined as the look, feeling, and identity associated with a person, place or thing, becomes the fulcrum in the culturally-framed redevelopment process and plays a vital role in maintaining the balance of growth and equity. The concept of authenticity is nebulous and amorphous, but continually is recognized as a certain intangible factor that draws people to live or frequent particular spaces. In U Street/Shaw, some residents see authenticity in the beautifully restored Victorian rowhomes in Logan Circle, in conversations that occur within Edges Barbershop on a Saturday morning, or at the Emancipation Day Celebration held at the Lincoln Theatre. A viable culturally-framed redevelopment plan requires an agreed-upon place-based definition of authenticity to be successful. The redevelopment process requires authenticity

---

1 See Chapter 2 for an in-depth discussion on the concept of authenticity.
to foster urban growth, but also needs existing resident engagement and support to bolster claims of authenticity.

Thus, culturally-framed redevelopment produces authenticity by promoting the consumption of a culturally diverse cityscape and drawing upon the history of local residents and the built environment to create a narrative which frames redevelopment and marketing efforts (Florida, 2002; Gotham, 2007; Hoffman, et al., 2003; Lin, 2010; Roodhouse, 2010; Zukin, 1986, 1999, 2010). City, market, and grassroots stakeholders collectively engage in this process by enhancing existing architectural, social, and historical assets that are considered to be desired by high-income residents while carefully removing or smoothing the rough edges of inner-city neighborhoods (e.g. low-income rental housing, homeless shelters, dilapidated infrastructure, Bell and Jayne 2004; Carr & Servon, 2009). As a result, new, wealthier residents and investors are relocating to urban cores, particularly within neighborhoods previously considered distressed causing issues of physical, political, and cultural displacement among the long-term, low-income minority population (Hyra, 2008; Massey & Denton, 1993; Pattillo, 2007). The opportunity exists for culturally-framed redevelopment to preserve rather than produce a neighborhood’s place-based authentic identity. However, the incentive to create a marketable neighborhood destination influences the preservation of authenticity in such a way as to produce a filtered narrative that is presented as authentic to attract a broad audience.

My research fills a gap in the existing literature by examining the intersection between cultural preservation and gentrification. Cultural preservation is defined as the use of historic preservation techniques along with oral history and archival research to frame redevelopment efforts within a particularly constructed cultural and historic neighborhood narrative. A neighborhood’s authenticity is produced through institutional and informal interactions (e.g.
public meetings, street interactions) between old and new residents and city-level stakeholders. As such, producing authenticity is an intentional and socially constructed act employed in order to implement a specific form of redevelopment and revitalization. My study employs an “extended case method” research design as described by Burawoy (1998) and ethnographic methods to analyze how the management of cultural preservation contributes to growth and equity in U Street/Shaw. The findings from this study will contribute to a growing body of research on the dynamics of neighborhood change elicited by culturally-framed redevelopment efforts.

The implications of this work are three-fold. First, this study provides a critical examination of how culturally-framed redevelopment outcomes compare to earlier forms of urban renewal in its ability to achieve equitable development for existing and new residents. The existing literature on cultural preservation suggests that the goals for framing heritage efforts in such neighborhoods are driven more by growth than social equity goals (Clark, 2011; Markusen & Gadwa, 2010a). As a result, cultural preservation may become a contributing factor to long-term resident displacement and current neighborhood conflicts. Second, findings uncover the rationale used by stakeholders to promote and preserve certain historical storylines over others that effect how neighborhoods are perceived and sense of belonging is maintained. Finally, the study examines the politics and power relations that drive this form of redevelopment and outlines recommendations for more inclusive redevelopment and preservation practices.

**Research Approach and Research Questions**

Previous studies have examined forms of culturally-framed redevelopment and its relationship to development outcomes and gentrification in center cities, but have not critically analyzed the planning process at a multi-scalar level as well as the associated institutions and stakeholders that framed the development process (Clark, 2011; Lloyd, 2009). My research
contributes to the existing literature by focusing on how the production of authenticity is mediated throughout planning processes, interactions between stakeholders, and placemaking in neighborhoods. Moreover, this study furthers Brown-Saracino’s (2009) problematization of preservation in gentrifying neighborhoods by investigating the motivations of all stakeholders in the development process rather than only residents. Finally, the study of cultural preservation in U Street/Shaw analyzes how heritage-related work and economic opportunities are distributed among the long-term population compared to new residents to determine who actually benefits from this form of redevelopment.

An investigation of the politics and processes of culturally-framed redevelopment lends itself to an “extended case method” ethnographic research approach as the implementation of this form of redevelopment is a contemporary phenomenon that potentially structures place brand marketing of a particular history at different scales (Burawoy, 1998; Yin, 2009). For example, place brand construction can occur at the overall neighborhood scale, through the restoration of unique assets and structures, and through carefully designed interactions between residents and visitors in terms of signage and event programming. The extended case method allows the researcher to develop an understanding of micro-level dynamics while also understanding the influence of external forces at various scales. Previous scholars have used ethnography to explore the dynamics between residents, businesses, and city interests as neighborhoods experience change including Lloyd’s (2009) work on the gentrification of Wicker Park in Chicago and Zukin’s (1986) seminal work on the loft movement in New York City. The ethnographic method allows the researcher to observe and participate in community life through daily interactions with community members; attendance and volunteering at local meetings and
events; conducting interviews with community stakeholders, residents, and visitors; and
experiencing various heritage sites and tours in neighborhoods (Bernard, 2005).

The research approach for this study is both inductive and deductive. Participant
observation in U Street/Shaw contributed to the development of theoretical concepts and patterns
to understand the phenomenon of culturally-framed redevelopment. For example, over 30
residents and stakeholders were formally interviewed on their thoughts and perceptions on
culturally-framed redevelopment in U Street/Shaw (See Appendix D for a list of participants). In
addition, drawing from my conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 2, I test the validity of
existing theories that argue growth interests often overrule equity interests in development
despite the presence of a number of stakeholders interested in cultural preservation (Lloyd, 2009;
Brown-Saracino, 2009). The guiding research question and three sub-questions below will seek
to answer the gaps in the existing literature described above:

**Guiding Research Question:** How are issues of growth and equity balanced in culturally-
framed redevelopment at different scales of the neighborhood’s development (e.g.
neighborhood, key landmarks, resident/visitor)?

**Sub-Questions:**
1.) Who are the actors in the planning effort and how do their perceptions, actions, and
motivations affect outcomes and possible benefactors of redevelopment efforts?

2.) Does the planning process affect social preservation efforts differently at different
scales of the planning process?

3.) How and why are certain historical facts and cultural assets used to create a particular
sense of place out of all possible narratives?

Combined, these research questions probe how growth and equity are balanced in
culturally-framed development efforts by examining neighborhood politics (Question 1), intra-
neighborhood dynamics and social preservation efforts (Question 2), and the placemaking
planning process (Question 3). The guiding hypothesis of this study is that initiatives that have
the potential to generate growth will consistently be preferred and implemented more often than social preservation efforts. To test this hypothesis the neighborhood’s level of development, efficacy of neighborhood institutions, and level of community engagement exhibited during the planning process serve as independent variables in the exploration of each scale of redevelopment. The scales analyzed as a part of this study are the overall neighborhood, cultural landmarks as targeted sites of redevelopment (anchors), and the individual scale of including exchanges between residents and visitors as they negotiate and reinforce the authentic identity of the neighborhood. I have defined the neighborhood’s chosen narrative, quantity and quality of social preservation efforts, and development potential of the neighborhood as dependent variables. The variables chosen are not easily quantifiable and require qualitative analysis through participant observation, interviews, and content analysis.

**Multi-Scalar Community Engagement and Research Objectivity**

In order to gain a holistic understanding of community dynamics, I engaged with stakeholders involved at each of the scales of U Street/Shaw’s culturally-framed redevelopment. My initial forays into the neighborhood centered largely around the non-profit organization, Cultural Tourism DC, which develops heritage trails for neighborhoods throughout the city (See Chapter 4 for more on this organization). Director of Heritage and Community Programs, Jane Levey, has been involved with the organization since shortly after its inception in the 1990s. As a stakeholder, Cultural Tourism DC spans the scales of culturally-framed redevelopment by engaging community residents in a planning process that chronicles and concretizes the oral and documented history of a neighborhood while also working closely with city-level stakeholders to augment the municipality’s tourism industry.

In my research, I made a conscious effort to interview and interact with both city and neighborhood stakeholders ranging from public officials to residents. I also attempted to draw a
representative sample of the neighborhood’s population according to the 2010 Census. This approach caused my sample to feature more residents who moved into the neighborhood within past ten years rather than long-term residents who lived in the community since the 1970s or earlier. While this could be viewed as a limitation of this study, the focus on recent residents critically engages perceptions of the targeted audience for culturally-framed redevelopment, young urban professionals—dubbed by Richard Florida (2002) as the creative class. Understanding this population’s views on culturally-framed redevelopment and issues of gentrification could have important policy implications for city’s as they continue to attract this highly coveted demographic.

It is important to note that I am also a member of the desired creative class that the city hoped to attract through the implementation of The DUKE Plan. While my student status does not match the income associated with members of the creative class, my high-level of education and age demographic (in my late-20s) are characteristics of this social group. In fact, my initial attraction to the U Street/Shaw neighborhood upon moving to the Washington Metro Area in 2009 was its emphasis on the neighborhood’s history and preservation of historic landmarks combined with entertainment venues and trendy restaurants. As a student of urban planning theory and history, particularly within African American neighborhoods, I was wary of the implications of supporting the neighborhood through my consumption of the landscape. Nevertheless, I continued to frequent the neighborhood so much that I eventually decided the best way to manage my conflicted feelings about the neighborhood would be to analyze its redevelopment as a form of cultural consumption penance. As such, I attempted to remain dedicated to my role as an objective researcher throughout my engagement with activists who
protested the displacement of residents as well as neighborhood leaders who supported the development of higher-income housing as a means to increase their property values.

My hope is that the findings of this study complicate the bandwagon of support that is often uncritically tied to culturally-framed redevelopment by pro-growth stakeholders. In addition, I aim to provide a deeper understanding of the common critiques of cultural preservation that occur during redevelopment. Moreover, I hope this research opens a space for dialogue within the academy and practice of urban affairs to critically examine and develop forms of sustainable equitable development that involve tangible measures including affordable housing availability as well as intangible measures of community empowerment and the politics of cultural preservation.

**Study Progression**

The study of the production of authenticity within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood is developed in six parts. This work begins by explaining the theoretical framework of “producing authenticity” and culturally-framed redevelopment. Chapter 2 constructs the theoretical framework while also outlining the major literatures of cultural development, inner-city redevelopment, and gentrification. Chapter 3 situates the case study of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood and Washington, DC. As the nation’s capital, Washington, DC’s governance structure and history is different from other American cities. At the same time, the ebbs and flows of inner-city life within U Street/Shaw are similar to many center city neighborhoods throughout the country.

Chapters 4 through 6 analyze the implementation and results of *The DUKE Plan* at each scale of development. In Chapter 4, the creation of heritage trails by Cultural Tourism DC are portrayed as the impetus for the adoption of particular narratives associated with the U Street/Shaw community and the subsequent division of the neighborhood into three distinct place
brands: U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle. This chapter also illustrates how place brands, narrative adoption, and an effort to enforce an Arts District brand simultaneously empowered and displaced long-term residents. Chapter 5 describes the redevelopment of two cultural landmarks at either end of the U Street corridor and the attempts by neighborhood and city stakeholders to re-create the Howard and Lincoln Theatres as community anchors. The divergent trajectories of each restoration project detail the difficulties in balancing growth and equity initiatives in the redevelopment of anchors as cultural, social, and economic centers. The balance of growth and equity at the individual level is examined in Chapter 6 including a dissection of the swagger-jacking debate that exploded in the community during the summer of 2012. Swagger-jacking was a term coined in opposition to the effects of culturally-framed redevelopment (Crockett, 2012a). The debate exhibits how residents and visitors rationalize and/or question the intentional use of cultural heritage as a redevelopment tactic.

In the conclusion, I summarize the growth and equity strategies and outcomes associated with culturally-framed redevelopment at each scale within the neighborhood. The findings suggest that the deregulated economy continues to force cities to value market growth over equitable development (Hyra, 2008; Sassen, 2002). In this concluding chapter, I discuss the consequences of combining a sensitive community attribute, such as its identity and history, as a tool for redevelopment; suggest recommendations for more equitable forms redevelopment; and describe study limitations and opportunities for future research.
CHAPTER 2
THE PRODUCTION OF AUTHENTICITY AS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The production of authenticity throughout culturally-framed redevelopment reflects the on-going construction of a socio-spatial order that values diversity, unique identities, and consumption while at the same time calling into question notions of legitimacy, equity in the politics of recognition, and the beneficiaries of development efforts. This chapter examines the relevant literatures of cultural development, inner-city development, and gentrification that inform the study of producing authenticity in Washington, DC. The theoretical framework for this study is grounded in the understanding that current planning trends, past planning efforts and on-going social processes at the local-level influence the balance of growth and equity in neighborhoods (Harvey, 1989; Logan & Molotch, 2007; Stone, 1989).

In this chapter, I define the concept of authenticity as well as its production through culturally-framed redevelopment. An overview of cultural development describes how the commodification of culture has become commonplace in urban planning practice. Past inner-city redevelopment strategems are contrasted with culturally-framed redevelopment practices. Redevelopment is often targeted within inner cities in the United States that have turbulent histories involving government neglect and manipulation (Briggs, 2005; Carr & Kutty, 2008; Massey & Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1996). In addition, a synopsis of the gentrification literature provides a means to analyze and critically understand the dynamics between city, commercial, and neighborhood stakeholders (both old and new residents).

Producing Authenticity: Defining Terms and the Process of Culturally-Framed Redevelopment

The following section outlines the guiding theoretical framework for the production of authenticity through the lens of culturally-framed redevelopment. First, both authenticity and culturally-framed redevelopment are defined. Second, the important differences between culture
and heritage are outlined to understand the role of each concept in redevelopment. Next, the conditions for culturally-framed redevelopment are described followed by an examination of the city’s role in this effort.

**Authenticity and Culturally-Framed Redevelopment**

Authenticity is a contentious term imbued with notions of power, legitimacy and subjectivity. However, the use of the term in this study is intentional. Simply put, authenticity refers to a commitment to the true identity or spirit of a person or place despite pressure from external sources. Authenticity is difficult to define because definitions of authenticity or authentic identity vary between groups and individuals based upon their particular past experiences (Giannini, 2010). Scholars generally agree that authenticity is a socially produced concept that is place-based and thus entrenched in the politics, history, and social life of that place (Lin, 2010; Wherry, 2011; Zukin, 2010). When the concept of authenticity is applied to the field of urban planning it engenders discussions of what belongs or is true to a space creating a dialogue about correctness that is veiled heavily in contextual ethics, norms and mores. Innes and Booher (2010) dub such issues “wicked problems” in which sensitive issues involve a diverse number of stakeholders decision-making process that express differing goals, politics, and values. For the purposes of this study, authenticity is defined as the aesthetics, feelings, history, cultural lifeways and social connectedness within and elicited by places (Zukin, 2010).

The production of authenticity within space and place is discussed either as a form of agency or commodification. For example, Brown-Saracino (2009) describes how authenticity may become an expression of agency within the gentrification process. New residents identify a particular group as authentic long-term residents. Then, residents (old and new) may join forces to actively protest or organize for the preservation of affordability or similar equity programs to help those long-term residents remain in the neighborhood. Thus, authenticity is maintained
through the presence of long-term residents. According to this understanding, authenticity as a form of social preservation becomes a point of empowerment and agency for new and old residents. In comparison, the commodification of culture in the formation of spaces described by consumers as unique or authentic has been documented by numerous social scientists (Clark, 2011; Florida, 2002; Harvey, 1989; Zukin, 1986, 1999, 2010). For Florida (2002), creating spaces with arts and cultural investments through public art, exhibition spaces, and venues attracts the creative class which in turn draws the attention of major businesses and firms to locate within a city. Zukin (1986, 1999, 2010), Clark (2011) and Harvey (1989) describe the process of producing authenticity through the intentional structuring of real-estate markets and landscapes that transform ways of life of particular cultures or industries into desired lifestyles and consumable products. The result creates an audience of urban resident consumers who desire to live in places that are gritty, true, and have a past—in essence, authentic. The two divergent definitions of producing authenticity reflect the push-pull dynamic between growth and equity that is inherently present in culturally-framed redevelopment efforts.

The process and politics of culturally-framed redevelopment influences the production of authenticity at various scales. As stated in the introduction, culturally-framed redevelopment purposefully draws upon assets associated with a social group that has been distinguished as the authentic identity for the community by its members as a means to theme redevelopment efforts within a marketable cultural and historic neighborhood narrative. Within the redevelopment process, the production of authenticity serves both as a form of agency for current residents and a vehicle for commodification for future residents and investors. The focus of this work is the implementation of a culturally-framed redevelopment plan. As such, the six-phases during which redevelopment is completed and authenticity is negotiated begins after a redevelopment plan has
been adopted by the municipality as a vision for the future. Throughout the process stakeholders provide input in the form of critiques, suggestions, and endorsements of the various projects implemented during culturally-framed redevelopment. However, an overall critique of the effects of the redevelopment effort tends to occur near the end of implementation (See Figure 2-1 below).

Figure 2-1: Culturally-Framed Redevelopment Process. From: Author.

During the first phase relevant stakeholders (e.g. city officials, planners, and landowners) develop a framework or plan that will guide the redevelopment of the neighborhood. Community residents are engaged during this process to assure that the plan will be supported politically and adopted by the appropriate governing body. Once the plan is adopted the responsibility to execute the plan is given to a particular government agency, often the planning department. Implementation of the plan may occur at various scales or levels to assure that the cultural narrative is fully realized and developed during revitalization. Efforts may occur at the entire neighborhood-level, small area sites, and at the individual level to engage residents in the support of the plan. During the second phase, stakeholders develop relationships with potential investors that understand and adopt the cultural identity associated with the redevelopment effort as a point of celebration and marketing tactic. Community members continue to support the plan through
engagement in small projects such as landmark restoration and establishing local and/or National Register historic district status. New residents to the neighborhood, possibly pioneers (members of the first-wave of new residents) in the gentrification process, similarly get involved in the effort as a means to increase the value and amenities in their neighborhood. Once a critical mass of investment has been made by the city, community and commercial stakeholders, media outlets begin to adopt a “transformation storyline.” The “transformation storyline” weaves together the historic narrative of the neighborhood with its rebirth through redevelopment. Over time, media reports reinforce the “transformation storyline” so much so that the narrative eventually becomes the identifier for the neighborhood.

Subsequent new residents (Phase 4) reinforce the narrative of redevelopment proffered by the adopted plan and media coverage. In doing so, authenticity of the neighborhood is defined on the street and at various government levels. As more residents are drawn to the neighborhood, businesses and neighborhood organizations draw on the adopted historic narrative to attract their customer base. Businesses may name themselves after a historic figure, sell culturally significant food or wares, or provide a service ancillary to an established heritage tourism destination. Finally, redevelopment is completed when the projects outlined in the plan have all been completed or are near completion. While opposition or critiques of the redevelopment plan may have occurred throughout the process, many critiques begin to gain traction in the media, by government leaders, and by scholars during this time. At this point in the process, it is often too late to correct some of the negative outcomes that may have occurred as a result of the redevelopment. By the conclusion of redevelopment, the historic narrative drawn upon in the plan, by investors, community residents (old and new), businesses, and even critics becomes the de facto authentic identity of the neighborhood. Understanding the differences and similarities
between culture and heritage is integral to understanding the process of culturally-framed redevelopment as a means to produce authenticity.

**Culture versus Heritage in Redevelopment**

The guiding forces that promote culturally-framed redevelopment as a desirable strategy also influence how culture and heritage are conceptualized. In turn, culture and heritage investments are shaped by these formulations. Culture and heritage are each socially constructed concepts that should not be considered as mutually exclusive, but as overlapping categories of identity and memory within a community, group, or individual. Scholars have recently taken up the concept of lifestyles as a means to explore the construction of identity built around the consumption patterns and preferences of certain groups (Pattillo, 2007). Lifestyles should not be confused with culture and heritage. Lifestyles incorporate notions of culture and heritage that may drive or encourage certain consumption practices, but lifestyles are also driven by structural characteristics such as socio-economic status (Lloyd, 2009; Zukin, 1986).

Culture and its transmutation into cultural investments within the urban planning field occur in two forms. First, culture is conceived as aesthetically pleasing, thought-provoking, or entertaining products that are bought and consumed. These forms of culture are part of the cultural economy such as theatre, art galleries, film, and music. Clark (2011) develops “the entertainment machine” concept to describe how cities are using culture and urban amenities to enhance their economies. Cities can create new entertainment areas or can conduct surveys to determine where cultural creative industries are naturally locating to determine where cultural growth should occur (Stern & Seifert, 2007). Cultural investments that address this concept of culture may include providing tax incentives for artists or creative industries to locate in a particular area of the city or the development of a large cultural district that includes a performing arts center or galleries. While some cultural investments may target local artists the
predominant focus is on building amenities to attract outsiders to the area more so than addressing concerns of existing residents. “Entertainment machine”-driven cultural investments mainstream culture for mass consumption which may result in the creation of alternative local art networks that resist the dominant meanings and practices of culture (Clark, 2011; Grams, 2010). Local art networks occur in the homes of cultural producers and consumers where alternative identities and themes of a neighborhood can be shared and exchanged. These networks may encourage piecemeal cultural investments such as arts-related grants and small gallery development. Alternative arts networks are not an official part of “entertainment machine,” but contribute to the connotation of an area as culturally rich, attractive, and authentic place to visit or live (Clark, 2011; Grams, 2010, Zukin, 2010).

Second, culture refers to a way of perceiving the world individually and collectively with a particular group. These include complex patterns of meaning, ways of knowing, attitudes towards space and time, and constructions of lived worlds including an individual’s place within society at multiple scales (Geertz, 1973; Bourdieu, 1993; Small et al., 2010). Cultural identity is continually being negotiated, interpreted, and reconstructed through every day practices that are informed through relationships to space, place, and other individuals and institutions in the past, present, and future (Foucault, 1984). Cultural investments relating to this form of culture are less common. Often, cultural investments of this nature essentialize easily recognizable characteristics of a cultural identity through the creation and maintenance of an urban landscape, (also referred to as ethnoscapes) that exoticizes a particular cultural identity and difference through streetscaping, branding, and cultural events. Cultural investments are closely linked to improving the tourism potential of an area within the city (Gotham, 2007). Opportunities for realizing multicultural and cosmopolitan goals do exist within these forms of investments, but
cities typically do not have the funding or long-term human capital required to maintain critical engagements between visitors, local tourists, and the residents who become part of the tourist attraction of these cultural investments (Grams & Farrel, 2008; Lin, 2010). An example of a cultural investment that overcomes the barriers of essentializing social group identity is the African American Civil War Memorial and Museum located on the U Street corridor. The museum enhances visitor’s comprehension of African American contributions to the Civil War through exhibits that tell the story of the United States Colored Troops. The museum also hosts ancestor events that provide descendants access to historical records to trace the histories of their relatives (AACWMM, 2013).

Heritage is a socially constructed and continually developing understanding of meaning in the present that is directly linked to the past and notions of the past (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998, 7). Heritage transfers value to an object or act in the past as a means of sharing and developing cultural memory. Cultural memory involves the negotiation between various social groups in the production of a shared narrative and cultural products that exemplify that narrative (Sturken, 1997). Similar to culture, heritage is also delineated into two types: performances and objects of memory. Heritage performances include festivals, tours, and other interactive ways that an individual can actively participate in a heritage event. Heritage investments by city and local stakeholders of this form include providing funds for heritage walking tours, ethnic food markets, and partnerships with cultural/ethnic community groups that host public events during which they share their particular heritage narrative (Lin, 2010).

Heritage as objects of memory concretize history and the past through preservation, exhibition, and interpretation of the built environment and material artifacts. The theory and methods of historic preservation, public history, public archaeology, and historical archaeology
regulate this type of heritage investment. Local, state, and federal regulations have been established for this form of heritage production causing historic preservation to be the most standardized form of heritage investments across the United States (Stipe, 2003). Investments range from the creation and maintenance of historic districts, landmarks, oral history projects, and heritage trails. Historic preservation requires the participation of specialists and professionals in the fields of history and archaeology and in many cases long-time members of the community. Through engagement with heritage investments residents and visitors reinforce a shared narrative of a place’s past and engage in cultural memory mass consumption (MacCannell, 1999; Sturken, 2007). Within theoretical and empirical explorations of cultural and heritage investments there are numerous permutations of these types of investments across various scales. These investments consistently identify difference and diversity of the present and the past as something to be valued, preserved, and consumed.

**The Conditions for Culturally-Framed Redevelopment**

In most cases, culturally-framed redevelopment is implemented by cities as a means to generate economic growth and development rather than to elicit a critical exploration of identities and the possibility for a multicultural city (Hyra, 2008; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Sandercock, 2003; Zukin, 2010). Culturally-framed redevelopment typically focuses on supporting the development of an entire neighborhood around a particular historical narrative creating a cultural/heritage destination district. However, culturally-framed redevelopment may occur within smaller geographic areas such as the clustering of a few unique sites within a neighborhood or on a piecemeal basis preserving particular landmarks. The types of culture and heritage investments will be further described in Chapter 4. Regardless of the scale of the project, theoretical and empirical evidence suggests there are five general conditions under which culturally-framed redevelopment is typically applied as a means to improve neighborhood
conditions and facilitate economic development. These conditions include: disinvestment, location, marketable difference, audience presence, and an available implementation strategy.

**Disinvestment.**

Areas targeted for culturally-framed redevelopment frequently have undergone a significant period of disinvestment (Brown-Saracino, 2010; Gotham, 2007; Hyra, 2008; Hoffman, 2003; Hurley, 2010; Lin, 2010; Lloyd, 2009; Pattillo, 2007; Roodhouse, 2010; Zukin, 1986). Historically segregated neighborhoods that have negative reputations are repeatedly areas in which cultural and heritage investments are utilized to develop positive associations with the area (Lloyd, 2009; Pattillo, 2007). Industrial areas within cities are also key locations as they no longer are active or generate a sizeable amount of capital for the city (Zukin, 1986). Disinvested areas meet Smith’s (1979) criteria for a substantial gap between current and potential ground-rent that cause an area to become “ripe” for development (Smith, 1979 in Brown-Saracino, 2010, 71). The built environment in distressed inner-city areas may contain the vernacular culture of low-rise storefronts or industrial lofts that appeal to the lifestyles of the creative class (Carr & Servon, 2009; Florida, 2002; Zukin, 1986). The material base of distressed areas within cities can provide the foundation of artist live-work spaces and cultural and heritage districts (Zukin, 2010).

**Location.**

Investments commonly occur near the urban core in order to generate economic growth. While Brown-Saracino (2009) has correctly argued that processes of gentrification, and tourism gentrification in particular, occur in both urban and rural settings, it has generally been found that culturally-framed redevelopment occurs adjacent or relatively near the urban core of cities and towns (Clark, 2011). The reason for the urban nature of these investments is twofold. First, inner-city neighborhoods are traditionally the oldest, most historic areas within a city or region
while also having a history as being sites for the settlement of various ethnic and cultural groups (Lin, 2010). Therefore, inner-city neighborhoods tend to have a significant number of available cultural and heritage assets that can be leveraged in a redevelopment effort. Second, center cities are the preferred place of residence of the population that is the targeted audience for cultural and heritage investments. Middle- and upper-income white-collar workers who are single and young often prefer to live closer to their places of work, which are often adjacent to the urban core (Florida, 2002).

**Difference.**

Post-industrial consumption patterns value difference. Following these patterns, culturally-framed redevelopment is targeted in areas where there is a type of difference that can be marketed to residents and outsiders. Difference is defined as identities and activities that are not routinized in modern middle-class, white American experience. For example, ethnic and racial identity and culture as well as arts-related industries are understood as types of difference that can be consumed through urban amenities. As stated above, inner cities generally have a higher proportion of historic structures and connections to historic ethnic enclaves within a community. In his examination of the gentrification of Wicker Park in Chicago, Lloyd (2009) also notes that artists tend to congregate in low-rent, gritty areas within the inner-city forming artist industry clusters. The categories of culture and heritage are ideal types of difference that cities identify when deciding where and how to encourage economic growth through these forms of investment.

**Targeted Audience.**

Cities must decide upon a target audience for their redevelopment effort in order to determine the appropriate method of framing and marketing their investment to capture that audience (Moilanen & Rainsto, 2009). White-collar workers and tourists are the most sought
after audiences in the post-industrial economy. The result of this targeting is a purification of culture and heritage that illustrates difference from the rest of the city, but in a standardized format of consumption through particular products such as heritage trails, signage, and entertainment (Hoffman, et al., 2003). Bell and Jayne (2004) consider this form of standardized difference as a purification of the heterogeneity of a post-modern landscape (251). In her exploration of authentic urban spaces, Zukin (2010) illustrates the standardization of ethnic groups as sellers of mass produced cultural goods in Santa Fe, New Mexico where tourists can purchase “authentic” artifacts. These examples depict how the culturally-framed redevelopment process is completed for the mass consumption of a specific audience.

**Implementation Strategies.**

Cities may focus on developing cultural amenities by adopting an “entertainment machine” approach or follow the guidelines and regulations established within the historic preservation field (Clark, 2011; Stipe, 2003). Drawing from post-modern planning theory, cities tend to choose cultural and heritage redevelopment projects that are “context-dependent” and place-based (Sandercock, 2003, 82). In an effort to distance historic preservation from gentrification processes, Hurley (2010) provides a case study of St. Louis where public archaeology, oral history, and historic preservation projects were developed and conducted with the existing residents of a historic African American community to facilitate community-driven economic development. In his varied explorations in ethnic places across the United States, Lin (2010) makes the case that the interactions between tourist and members of a marketed ethnic community can be considered a “multicultural transformation” of public history as well as the mass consumption of a particular social group by another (23).
City Politics in Culturally-Framed Redevelopment

The socio-political climate within a city’s government structure influences which entities, groups, and individuals are considered legitimate stakeholders. As the central authority within the redevelopment effort, the city authorizes the level of engagement throughout the development process. Moreover, the city’s economic, social, and political goals inform the amount of power or influence afforded to particular stakeholders (Pattillo, 2007). For example, Hyra (2008) describes how the political structure of New York City and Chicago affected how programs and policies were implemented in historically African American communities. In the case of culturally-framed redevelopment, the cities tend to privilege potential investors and cultural industries over existing residents as the majority of districts are established as a means to increase economic growth (Roodhouse, 2010). Still, cities have made efforts to preserve the lifestyles in neighborhoods targeted for redevelopment as a form of community development and tactic to correct social inequities (Lin, 2010). The sections below outline pro-growth and preservation-oriented culturally-framed redevelopment strategies.

Pro-Growth Culturally-Framed Redevelopment.

Pro-growth strategies capitalize or develop the market potential of a neighborhood that may or may not exist within a community. Both economically robust and struggling cities may implement a pro-growth strategy. Pro-growth strategies employ culturally-framed redevelopment in areas that are identified by the city as targets for revitalization. The vision for these efforts is to improve the property values within the neighborhood through development rather than preserve a particular identity or sense of place within the district. Other pro-growth incentives include investments in urban amenities, tax incentives for developer investment, and using TIFs (Tax Increment Financing) to develop large-scale projects. These strategies attempt to capitalize on resident and visitor consumption patterns to retain a strong city economy (Clark, 2011).
Stakeholder engagement in a pro-growth model values developer and investor relationships more so than existing residents. Neighborhoods that witness revitalization under this strategy are seen by cities as a way to increase the exchange value rather than a place’s use value as perceived by residents and visitors (Logan & Molotch, 2007).

**Preservation-Oriented Culturally-Framed Redevelopment.**

Preservation-oriented redevelopment mitigates displacement of a cultural community as tourism and economic growth occur. During the implementation process, there are various entry-points through which citizen activism and engagement can influence redevelopment (Borrup, 2006; Goldbard, 2006; Roodhouse, 2010; Young, 2008). Local-level historic preservation can engage residents who live in historic structures and districts. In addition, resident empowerment is supported through broadening social networks in the development process. For example, place branding networks include existing residents as stakeholders in the branding process as do neighborhood-based tourism development initiatives (Jensen, 2007; Smith, 2008). Active citizen engagement within these processes that encourage preservation of culture and heritage may influence the decision of a city to preserve rather than redevelop a neighborhood.

Preservation strategies focus on the retention and enhancement of a particular cultural and heritage asset or identity that exists within a place. Community land trusts and inclusionary zoning can be used to maintain affordability for residents who are members of a cultural community as tourism development attracts new investment to the district (Hurley, 2010). Cities can also adopt regulations to assure that a particular way of life within the community is preserved. Cities can regulate the types of businesses that locate in a neighborhood as well as require that a certain number of employees are community residents (Bell and Jayne, 2004).

The theoretical understanding of culturally-framed redevelopment and authenticity are informed by three major literatures. The subsequent sections provide an examination of the
literatures that support and inform the framework for examining the production of authenticity. Cultural development, inner-city redevelopment strategems, and the literature of gentrification provide insights to the social, political and economic dynamics within the U Street/Shaw community.

**Cultural Development**

Cultural development is a body of literature that examines the motivations and methods behind the structuring of neighborhoods and city spaces as sites of difference. The impetus of cultural development was the transformation of cities from centers of blue-collar production under Fordism to centers of white-collar consumption in a post-Fordist economy (Collins, 2003; Harvey, 1989; Palan, 2003). Subsequently, the cultural consumption patterns of the young professional became the driving force of urban development for many cities that followed Richard Florida’s (2002) mantra that the key to economic growth lay in attracting the creative class by promoting the arts, entertainment, and tolerance (Clark, 2002; Landry, 2008; Lloyd, 2009; Zukin, 1999). Cultural development draws upon existing as well as creating new cultural and heritage assets within a community.

Understanding cultural development as a recent innovation of post-industrial society changes how space and place are conceptualized in cities by scholars as well as in everyday life. Areas that are targeted for culturally-framed redevelopment are both multilocal and multivocal. As spaces for both visitors and residents that market a particular identity; neighborhoods that undergo culturally-framed redevelopment are socially constructed through reflexive identity formation in everyday practices and macro-level interactions (Rodman, 2003). Redeveloping a neighborhood as a site of cultural preservation for the joint purposes of economic growth and tourism may redefine authenticity within a place by privileging the history or identity of one
social group within a neighborhood over another (Brown-Saracino, 2009). Thus, culturally-framed redevelopment becomes an instrument for a socio-spatial order that simultaneously promotes the consumption and aestheticization of difference as well as the homogenization of cityscapes and creative industry activities.

The literature of cultural development finds that culturally-framed redevelopment differs from previous urban planning strategies in the intentional production of a place of difference and diversity. Besides historic preservation policy, the qualifications of how a place is different and diverse are not regulated through any formal legislation as other elements of planning such as water management, environmental planning, and growth management planning have been regulated (Roodhouse, 2010). Different from previous forms of redevelopment, cultural preservation does not abide solely by free market principles. By intentionally investing in a neighborhood’s identity, a city and its associated stakeholders actively decide the neighborhood’s authenticity, sense of belonging, and how notions of culture and heritage are conceptualized within a pro-growth lens (Zukin, 2010).

The consequences of cultural development fall under two ideal types: multicultural inclusivity and pure economic gain (similar to the pro-growth and preservation-oriented strategies outlined above). Some scholars contend that the process and impacts of culturally-framed redevelopment can support the development of inclusive, mixed-income, mixed-race communities (Goldbard, 2006; Lin, 2010; Sandercock, 2003). Drawing from a post-modern perspective, Sandercock (2003) puts forth an epistemology of multiplicity that occurs at the soft infrastructure (relational level) of collaborative planning. Given the rising multicultural environment of cities and communities, contemporary planning theorists urge planners to broaden their sources of information to incorporate listening and collaborating with residents.
Planners should work with community residents to gather, filter and judge ways of knowing. Good planning is identified by the planner’s ability to perceive the appropriate moment to utilize particular ways of knowing, such as types of culture and heritage, and consider knowledge as “context-dependent” (Sandercock, 2003, 82). In addition to scientific and technical ways of knowing, planners must be familiar with tacit and explicit local knowledge. Local knowledge includes music, symbols, stories, and landscapes among other ways of knowing.

Sandercock’s (2003) argument for the inclusion of multiple knowledges in planning has led to the development of types of literacies in which urban planners must now be fluent—cultural, ethical, and strategic (Wood & Landry, 2007; Young, 2008). Cultural literacy is the ability to garner, interpret, and apply knowledge about the different cultures within a community (Wood & Landry, 2007). Next, ethical literacy is an understanding of the ethical boundaries in which planners operate. Lastly, strategic literacy is illustrated by a command of the varying natures and utilities of different planning techniques. Combined, these literacies are thought to aid planners in contextualizing problems and solutions in an equitable and productive manner (Young, 2008). In accounts of multicultural inclusivity, participatory planning and engagement techniques are an integral part of the planning process including facilitated dialogues and shared ownership in development outcomes (Brown-Saracino, 2009; Wherry, 2011).

Other studies have found that culturally-framed redevelopment simply results in economic development benefits for investors and city interests while reinforcing existing spatial divides and forms of social exclusion (Clark, 2011; Lloyd, 2009; Zukin, 2010). In both of these ideal types, preservation and development/gentrification are considered as separate forces that may be in conflict with one another, especially in minority-majority neighborhoods (Costonis, 1989; Hyra, 2008; Kaufman, 1998; Patillo, 2007; Shaw et al., 2004).
**Inner-City Renewal, Economic and Community Development**

This section provides a brief overview of the history of inner-city neighborhood development in the 20th century. Inner-city minority neighborhoods have been manipulated and negatively impacted by government, market, and other institutional forces that resulted in high poverty and crime rates as well as a lack of education and employment opportunities (Briggs, 2005; Carr & Kutty, 2008; Massey & Denton, 1993). Current planning initiatives advocate equity and social justice (Briggs, 2005; Thomas & Ritzdorf, 1997; Snadercock, 2003). As a part of this movement, culturally-framed redevelopment efforts that recognize the particular histories of minority communities have grown in popularity as a way for minority residents to celebrate their heritage through festivals, landmarks, and businesses related to a neighborhood’s history as a means to develop the area’s economy.

**Theorizing the State of Historically Low-Income African American Neighborhoods**

Employing culturally-framed redevelopment in low-income communities forces planners and city governments to confront the history of inequitable development that contributed to black inner-city poverty (Lin, 2010). Logan and Molotch’s (2007) “growth machine” theory conceptualizes urban development as a socially constructed process by an arrangement of government institutions and pro-growth stakeholders. Government institutions and pro-growth stakeholders throughout American history made land-use decisions through a segregationist lens (Massey & Denton, 1993). Beginning in the early 1900s, restrictive covenants in neighborhoods forbid African Americans and other minorities from living within certain parts of a city. New forms of institutional racism—the concretization of bias or discrimination through policy—continued throughout the mid-20th century as planners and politicians encouraged and accommodated white residents moving from the city to the suburbs, while segregating minorities within the inner-city (Yinger, 1995).
White suburbanization and formation of segregated center cities created a two-fold social disparity based on race and class (Silver & Moeser, 1995). During segregation, African American communities such as the U Street/Shaw neighborhood in Washington, DC and Harlem in New York City, among others maintained vibrant business corridors, community groups, and institutions that serviced the residents of the neighborhood. After desegregation in the 1950s and 60s, middle-class blacks began to move to the suburbs leaving low-income African Americans in the center city. A consequence of the middle-class black out-migration was “the paradox of desegregation” where blacks lost power and influence as a direct result of their integration into other parts of the city and region (Marable, 2002).

Simultaneous to black flight, inner-city urban renewal programs focused on slum removal as a means of “cleaning up” American urban cores (Yinger, 1995). Large numbers of minority households were displaced from areas in which they had built complex webs of social networks for survival (Stack, 1998, 1975). After urban renewal programs were completed, inner-city neighborhoods continued to exhibit high poverty rates. Low-income African American neighborhoods were designated as areas of crime, poverty, and decay. After two decades of disinvestment, from 1970 to 1990, poverty rates in these neighborhoods increased exponentially (Wilson, 1996). Despite their derelict state, the built environment of these neighborhoods was largely left untouched, including historic structures. Moreover, traditions such as “spinning a yarn” at the barber shop and church activities maintained the cultural identity of the community (Hoffman, 2003; Ugochukwu, 2006, 72).

2 Particularly, African Americans were segregated into older inner city neighborhoods that were consistently denied infrastructure based on the idea that black-majority neighborhoods were a poor economic investment. Such ideology was translated into official policy such as redlining, blockbusting, and predatory lending (Massey & Denton, 1993).
Two principle theories were put forth as an answer to the issue of inner-city poverty: reincorporation and deconcentration. William Julius Wilson’s (1996) reincorporation theory calls for a return of the black middle-class to the city to aid and educate poverty-stricken blacks. Comparatively, Massey and Denton (1993) suggest deconcentrating the poor from the inner-city to other areas within the metropolitan region as a means to undo nearly a century and a half of institutional racism. In reality, both of these processes began to occur in center cities beginning in the 1990s, but for neither of the reasons these authors promoted. Rather, the concurrent development of real estate revitalization and cultural recognition in these neighborhoods attracted new residents from a variety of social and ethnic backgrounds. Historically distressed neighborhoods became targets for gentrification as more middle- and upper-class workers desired to live closer to the urban core (Brown-Saracino, 2009; Grams, 2010; Hoffman et al., 2003; Hyra, 2008; Jackson, 2003; Pattillo, 2007; Zukin, 2010). Since the 1990s, some inner-city neighborhoods in cities experiencing consistent growth have undergone a major demographic shift from being predominantly low-income African American to being higher-income neighborhoods with a more diverse population.

**Past Inner-City Planning Initiatives.**

Past planning interventions in low-income African American communities emphasized directing new flows of capital into neighborhoods, deconcentrating the poor, and addressing long-term social inequity through economic initiatives. The first comprehensive program that addressed inner-city inequity was President Johnson’s Model Cities program that directed initiatives through the newly formed Department of Housing and Urban Development. Model cities endeavored to create new modes of citizen engagement and enfranchisement while also addressing quality of life issues, but failed in its ability to manage conflict within communities (Thomas & Ritzdorf, 1997).
Efforts to further the tenets of Model Cities arose in advocacy and equity planning programs that proposed placing planning overtly in the political context in order to raise planners’ consciousness of the political, economic, and socio-cultural context of planning (Baum, 2003; Beauregard, 2003; Campbell, 2003; Davidoff, 2003). Both advocacy and equity planners sought, and continue to seek, to identify, clarify and publicize the interests of community stakeholders who oppose government initiatives through an increase in public participation and involvement (Basolo & Strong, 2002; Krumholz, 1997a; 1997b). Elements of advocacy and equity planning have been incorporated into mainstream practices leading to a “watered-down” version of community involvement within the planning process in most cities (Sandercock, 2003). Subsequent inner-city planning initiatives combined social welfare programs with economic development to create less segregated and more mixed-income communities in the center city.³ This section describes three key examples of modern inner-city planning programs: Empowerment Zones, tax increment financing (TIFs), and deconcentrating the poor through mixed-income housing, transportation, and education programs.

**Empowerment zones.**

Empowerment zones were created in 1993 under President Clinton to provide economic development opportunities to distressed communities that have experienced out-migration and high poverty rates. The empowerment zone program gave areas designated access to tax breaks and bond authority to promote business growth. Businesses receiving incentives within empowerment zones were required to employ individuals who lived within the boundaries of the zone itself. In addition to these benefits, the local government would also receive a significant

³ For the purposes of brevity, the complex arguments surrounding the persistence of racism throughout inner city planning initiatives will not be brought up as a major point of discussion in this section other than to comment on the particular programs that the author has chosen to highlight. However, it is important to note that structural inequality between whites and blacks continues through access to wealth, education, transportation and other vital aspects of a “good” quality of life, particularly within inner cities (See Briggs, 2005; Carr & Kutty, 2008; and Yinger, 1995).
block grant for the purposes of developing business and employment opportunities. The impacts of empowerment zones have provided some employment opportunities for existing residents in the low-paying service and retail sector while developing the amenities frequented by white-collar workers (Hyra, 2008; Zukin, 2010).

**TIFs.**

Tax increment financing (TIFs), similar to empowerment zones, positions a particular area to benefit from the location of business and industry within its boundaries. TIFs use future tax gains to finance improvements to an area’s economy or infrastructure. The TIF process includes assessing tax value prior to development as well as the expected tax value after the proposed development is completed. These establish an area’s “tax increment base value” and “tax increment,” respectively. The latter value is used to issue bonds to finance the proposed development (Johnson & Mann, 2001). Bonds are paid back by the municipality through the “captured assessed value” which is the difference between the base value and increment value (Hyra, 2008, 50). The results of TIFs are similar to empowerment zones providing overall economic growth that can sometimes directly benefit long-term community members.

**Poverty deconcentration.**

Poverty deconcentration programs consist of three categories: transportation, education, and creation of mixed-income communities. Transportation initiatives address the mismatch between the location of low-income African Americans in the center city and the location of the places where they work, which are often located at the outer edges and suburban area of the metropolitan region (Carr & Kutty, 2008). Education programs focus on providing job training and skills within inner-city communities that can help residents gain employment in higher-earning industry sectors (McCoy and Vincent, 2008). Both transportation and education
programs do not solve long-term structural inequity, but improve access for those living in the inner-city and broaden employment and social opportunities.

Mixed-income community programs such as HOPE VI and President Obama’s Choice Neighborhoods deconcentrate poverty by redeveloping existing public housing within inner cities and replacing them with housing structures that provide a combination of market-rate and subsidized housing. Mixed-income projects are grounded in the ideology that by bringing people with diverse incomes in contact with one another lower-income individuals will benefit from the education, social, and business networks of their higher-income neighbors (Briggs, 2005). These tactics are grounded in Putnam’s (2000) arguments regarding social capital. Social capital refers to a person’s friends, family, and acquaintances. Putnam (2000) found that neighborhoods with stronger social networks were more resilient and robust. Mixed-income developments provided a space for low-income residents to bridge their social capital networks through acquaintances with higher-income residents that may result in increased opportunities such as employment and social support. Bridging social networks with people who you do not normally interact with is found to generate greater opportunities than bonding with those people you already know (Putnam, 2000). Findings that support this argument are mixed and controversial. Many inner-city residents feel a sense of loss with the dramatic shifts they witness in their community as long-time residents move out and new residents move into the neighborhood (Abbott, 2008; Brown-Saracino, 2009; Freeman, 2006; Hyra, 2008; Hoffman, 2003; Jackson, 2003; Pattillo, 2007).

Empowerment zones, TIFs, and poverty deconcentration programs continue to be implemented by cities to solve the effects of long-term disinvestment in inner-city minority-majority neighborhoods. These policies focus on economic development and demographic
changes as a means to intersperse poverty throughout the metropolitan region rather than keep a considerable amount of poverty within one particular space in the city. As such, these policies do not directly address the structural inequities that continue to result in a disproportionate amount of poverty among the African American population. In the wake of calls for innovative methods for engaging the poor in African American neighborhoods, cultural and heritage investments have the potential to critically engage culture in both identity construction processes and engagement within the current political economic system.

**Culturally-Framed Redevelopment: A Strategy for Growth and Empowerment?**

Culturally-framed redevelopment strategically markets the perceived positive aspects of the African American inner-city that are most appealing to outsiders that value cultural consumption and difference (Bell and Jayne, 2004; Florida, 2002; Roodhouse, 2010). Numerous scholars, for example, have described the intentional marketing of African American history with an emphasis on historical entertainers, artists, and writers in order to attract higher-income individuals and families to live in and visit inner-city neighborhoods (Grams, 2010; Gotham, 2007; Hyra, 2008; Jackson, 2003; Pattillo, 2007; Ruble, 2010; Zukin, 2010). Historic structures and particular narratives are teased out and edited through preservation and tourism efforts to renew the neighborhood’s reputation and positively display the neighborhood to outsiders (Fine and Spear, 1985; Jackson et al., 2006; Kaufman, 1998; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Smith, 2008; Sturken, 2007).

Initiatives that leverage cultural and heritage assets have not replaced past planning programs such as those previous discussed. Rather, culture and heritage provide a new framing device through which all other programs become united in restoring a disinvested neighborhood to its historical or cultural “heyday” (Hoffman, 2003; Ruble, 2010). In his groundbreaking work on the study of modern tourism, Dean MacCannell (1999) describes the framing process of a
cultural experience as “a process of protecting and enhancing” a sight in comparison to other parts of the landscape (44). Cultural and heritage investments draw attention to a particular aspect of an area’s history that pushes concerns with crime and poverty to the background in the eyes of visitors, newcomers, and possible investors (Zukin, 2010). In this way, cultural and heritage investments continue the goals of poverty deconcentration and economic growth while also recognizing the value of cultural life that remains in these neighborhoods. Key strategies that reveal this dichotomy include infrastructure improvements, historic preservation, tourism development, and vernacular culture-based development.

*Creating a smooth space for development.*

Many inner-city African American neighborhoods are in need of standard infrastructure improvements due to a significant period of disinvestment (Abbott, 2008; Lin, 2010). Cities may tackle dilapidated infrastructural issues in neighborhoods as an initial step towards increasing development and growth in the area. Possible improvements include developing mass transit, increasing public transit routes, road and sidewalk enhancement, and systematic surveys of the building and housing stock in an area to investigate the possibilities of large-scale or systematic redevelopment.

Infrastructure projects correct one type of disinvestment within neighborhoods and create a “smooth space” upon which to overlay the cultural and heritage investments that will follow (Bell and Jayne, 2004). These physical improvements do not differ greatly from previous planning programs within low-income black neighborhoods. The projects may be small or large and possibly displace existing residents. Creating a “smooth space” through infrastructural improvements is the foundation upon which culturally-framed redevelopment is often built.
Finding a narrative in the built environment.

Historic preservation efforts help inner-city neighborhoods transform from areas known as dangerous and dead spaces within a city to centers of living history. Preservation provides another medium through which the city, residents, and visitors can renegotiate and re-form constructions of place and identity. After or simultaneous to infrastructural improvements, historic preservation efforts can identify key landmarks of a neighborhood’s historical and heritage identity (Hoffman, 2003; Ruble, 2010). In addition, many inner-city neighborhoods contain some of the oldest housing stock in the city which is valued by members of the white-collar service sector who prefer to live in authentic, character-rich places as opposed to the suburbs of mass-production in which they were typically raised (Hyra, 2008; Lloyd, 2009; Zukin, 1986, 1999, 2010).

The relationship between historic preservation, empowerment, and economic development is highly contested. Numerous case studies have provided arguments that historic preservation can contribute to the gentrification of a neighborhood and subsequent displacement of long-term African American residents (Brown-Saracino, 2009; Pattillo, 2007). Yet a direct connection between historic preservation and economic growth has not been found in existing data or literature (Mason, 2005). Historic preservation has been correlated to increased property values and contributing to the construction of “smooth space” that infrastructural improvements also provide (Bell and Jayne, 2004). Historic preservation scholars are wary to attach themselves wholly to the notion that their efforts are directly linked to economic growth. Rather, proponents of historic preservation argue that their efforts serve multiple needs of society by providing links to the past, aesthetic landscapes, and environmentally sustainable practices in addition to possible positive economic outcomes (Rypkema, 2005; Stipe, 2003).
Evidence of resident empowerment as a result of historic preservation efforts is equally mixed. The existing historic structures and memories that can be captured through oral history projects create a web of narratives from which a city can draw upon to market the unique attributes of their particular inner-city African American neighborhoods. Story-telling, sharing, and participation in these processes does have the potential to empower residents to feel an increased sense of belonging and recognition from city officials (Hurley, 2010; Innes & Booher, 2010; Thomas, 2004; Sandercock, 2003). However, historic preservation efforts have yet to lead to the political empowerment of a disenfranchised group (Kaufman, 1998).

Historic preservation stands in sharp contrast to previous planning programs through the intentional identification of structures, stories, and memories that currently exist within the community and contain a certain immeasurable value (Hurley, 2010; Thomas, 2004). The rationale behind empowerment zones, TIFs, and deconcentration programs is that low-income African American communities are empty and must have value in the form of capital (human and financial) injected into its boundaries in order for economic development to occur. Despite concerns with displacement associated with historic preservation efforts, identifying cultural and heritage assets in low-income black neighborhoods recognizes the value of African American culture and history in communities that often feel disenfranchised and isolated from the rest of the city (Goldbard, 2006).

**Marketing a narrative: The coterminous development of tourism and branding.**

The tourism aspect of culturally-framed redevelopment focuses on attracting outsiders into the community rather than building human capital, education opportunities, and wealth accumulation within the community (Bell and Jayne, 2004; Clark, 2011; Hoffman et al., 2003; Roodhouse, 2010). Tourism and branding are interrelated endeavors that cities use to market a re-constituted identity of historically low-income black communities. Historic preservation and
public history projects can help cities and key stakeholders develop a master narrative in which to frame the identity of the neighborhood (Hoffman, 2003; Jackson, 2003; Ruble, 2010). These narratives are socially constructed through resident and visitor experiences and interactions as well as the cultural production and consumption of tourism and branding.

Place branding is the intentional identification or creation of a place’s unique characteristics marketed to the public for the purposes of generating increased interest (e.g. visual, economic) in the place (Ashworth, 2009; Kavaratzis, 2005). Place branding is understood by city administrators as a way to attract new residents while maintaining current resident satisfaction within an increasingly global marketplace that accelerated competition between cities. In center cities, place branding acts as a conscious effort to change the way low-income African American neighborhoods are perceived by higher-income earning socio-economic groups. Branding can have positive effects on the existing residents by building a sense of neighborhood pride, but is more often used as a tool to further redevelopment (Moilanen & Rainsto, 2009).

Tourism investments that feature culture landmarks in African American communities support the re-branding and re-connoting of these neighborhoods as places safe for investment and consumption. Moreover, the tourism sector represents the largest industry worldwide that cities can profit from no matter where visitors are touring within the city (Hoffman, 2003). Tourism regulates how residents and visitors interact within the city representing a novel form of socio-spatial control. Culturally-framed redevelopment in black neighborhoods creates safe tourist bubbles for visitors to frequent including historic landmarks and urban entertainment amenities (Clark, 2011; Hoffman et al., 2003). In order to attract visitors, the “smooth space” created through infrastructure and historic preservation becomes the focal points of tourist
consumption. These become the places tourists choose to go to experience authentic urban
culture and heritage (Bell and Jayne, 2004; MacCannell, 1999; Zukin, 2010).

In comparison to the outcomes of empowerment zones and TIFs, tourism also maintains
the status quo of employment opportunities within inner-city neighborhoods. Tourism-related
industries employ low-wage; part-time labor requiring a limited skill set that continues the dearth
of well-paying jobs within low-income, minority neighborhoods. In describing the impact of
tourism on Harlem, Hoffman (2003) contends that increased tourism has translated into benefits
for resident such as decreased crime and engagement with a wider variety of people that were not
associated with past programs.

**Vernacular culture-based redevelopment.**

Current city redevelopment efforts are influenced by the consumption patterns of the
creative class. The creative class prefers consuming landscapes of difference and variety which
does not fit the modernist aesthetic that exists in many downtowns that were redeveloped
between 1960 and the early 1990s. In order to adjust to these new cultural consumption
preferences, cities have re-tooled investments in African American communities to feature the
adaptive reuse of historic structures and attempts to maintain the vernacular culture of the
existing urban form along business corridors (Carr & Servon, 2009). Vernacular culture-based
development combines historic preservation with entrepreneurship to provide spaces for
neighborhood-oriented businesses to flourish.

Since the 1980s the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) has led vernacular
culture-based redevelopment through its Main Street Program. Main Street programs draw upon
four points to revitalize inner cities by leveraging existing cultural and heritage assets. Once a
program is established Main Street staff work to organize the community to establish a broad
social and business partnership network that can be drawn upon to promote the businesses and
residences within the area. The next two steps draw upon strategies previously discussed such as improving infrastructure along a corridor through design and streetscaping improvements. Next, the corridor undergoes an economic restructuring of the business community through retention of existing businesses and promotion of new commercial opportunities (Stipe, 2003). The Main Street program and others that provide similar services have been implemented in historically African American neighborhoods as a way to reinvigorate struggling business corridors that once were vibrant during the segregation era (Ruble, 2010). Vernacular culture-based redevelopment retains the character of the built environment of African American neighborhoods, but does not safeguard against potential displacement of long-term resident-owned businesses or residents if property values and rents increase in the neighborhood.

Each of the cultural and heritage strategies discussed above illustrate the tenuous nature of redevelopment in low-income African American communities. Culture and heritage are easily used as surface-level frames and brands through which to draw in higher-income residents and engender processes of gentrification and displacement. As opposed to previous programs, these efforts maintain an emphasis on economic growth, but also attribute value to the historic and living cultural identities that exist within these neighborhoods. The dual nature of cultural and heritage investments as engines of growth and formal recognitions of cultural life provide opportunities for both gentrification and empowerment through the negotiation of a broader community identity.

**Challenges and Opportunities of Culturally-Framed Redevelopment in Inner Cities.**

Sense of place is both a communal and individual creation. Individual experiences act in the assembly of personal cultural perspectives to form multiple senses of place within a place-

---

4 The four points are called: organization, promotion, design, and economic restructuring (Stipe, 2003).
based community (Abbott, 2008; Bourgois, 1995; Stewart, 1996). Previous planning programs have conceived of blacks living in inner-city neighborhoods as a monolithic category (black, urban, poor). Culturally-framed redevelopment has the ability to both complicate and continue these existing notions of what it means to be an African American living in a center city neighborhood (Goldbard, 2006; Hoffman, 2003; Hurley, 2010). Historic preservation and oral history can be used to capture the nuances of heritage and cultural identity. Alternatively, tourism and place branding frequently essentialize identity into an easily consumable cultural product. Redevelopment within inner-city neighborhoods is now predicated on the recognition and promotion of a cultural identity that was viewed as shameful or non-existing throughout certain historical eras (Ruble, 2010). As new residents move into these previously isolated neighborhoods conflicts will arise surrounding notions of authenticity and what identities belong in these places. While conflicts present a challenge to residents, visitors, and other stakeholders they also represent the strength of minority community solidarity that can be supported through culturally-framed redevelopment.

**Gentrification and Neighborhood Change**

The term “gentrification” has taken on a negative connotation in modern society due to its association with wealthy investors characterized as “greedy pioneers” and the displacement of long-time residents who are framed as victims of development (Smith, 1998). Early studies contended that gentrification could only occur in global cities where transnational corporations, developers, and city stakeholders worked together to restructure urban space, but presently small towns, rural and urban, are also witnessing the challenges of gentrification (Atkinson & Bridge, 2004; Brown-Saracino, 2009; Glass, 1964; Pike, et al., 2006; Sassen, 2002). The process of gentrification involves an economic transformation that affects both geographic and social
realms of communities. Gentrification is also influenced by the structure and perceptions of city governments, developers, and activism of neighborhood residents. Gentrification may also occur in neighborhoods that were the focus of community development efforts that snowballed into market-driven gentrification.

**Types of Gentrification**

There are two forms of gentrification that are characterized by the effect market forces have on urban space. Market-driven gentrification involves overt interventions by development stakeholders (e.g. city government, transnational corporations) to purposefully restructure the social, economic, and physical environment of a neighborhood. In comparison, market-obeying gentrification includes more discreet forms of development and stakeholder intervention that support already existing social and market trends. In both forms of gentrification, macro-level forces such as market trends affect the form and function of neighborhoods. Smith (1979) describes market-driven gentrification as a product of the state and market deregulation that encourage developers to invest in areas where a rent-gap exists between current and potential rents. Conversely, Logan and Moloch (2007) argue that a coalition of elite development stakeholders work in concert to assure the redevelopment of particular spaces. Thus, market-driven gentrification occurs when either or both market and stakeholder forces transform the desirability of a neighborhood that produces an increase in property values.

Market-obeying gentrification processes occur in a myriad of interactions between consumer desires and actors within the financial market. Changing consumption patterns of the middle-class have resulted in a resurgence of upper-income individuals and families moving back to the inner-city (Ley, 1996). Some members of these new urbanists consider themselves pioneers reclaiming the inner-city (Smith, 1998). In other instances, investments in low-rent areas by particular groups such as artists and musicians develop into cluster economies that
attract the middle-class (Zukin, 1986). Businesses and corporations may also make strategic investments in particular neighborhoods for the purposes of themed development such as tourism and cultural consumption (Gotham, 2005; Porter & Shaw, 2009).

In both market-driven and market-obeying gentrification community development can serve to instigate or inhibit the displacement of long-time residents. For example, Zukin’s (1986) description of the development of artist lofts in New York City that created a cluster economy and related institutions is a form of community development that, along with city rezoning strategies, resulted in gentrification. At the same time, efforts to preserve affordable housing in gentrified neighborhoods such as Villa Victoria in Boston exhibit how community development can work to mitigate displacement and ameliorate the social tensions that arise during the gentrification process (Small, 2004).

Social Impacts of Gentrification

The impact of gentrification on social engagement within communities centers on the motivations of gentrifiers, how new and old residents interact, and the balance between negative and positive outcomes. People move back to the inner-city and low-income neighborhoods for different reasons. They may be seeking to make a profit off of their investment in the community, be drawn to the area due the cluster of needs it provides, or be genuinely interested in the history of the community and its preservation (Brown-Saracino, 2009). For example, upper-income black residents made a choice to move back to historic inner-city neighborhoods in Chicago in an attempt to return to their roots and possibly re-establish the valor associated with the community (Hyra, 2008; Pattillo, 2007; Taylor, 2002).

5 In Small’s (2004) account he describes the conflicts that occurred within Villa Victoria in Boston, MA and its neighboring, gentrified community. However, the maintenance of affordable housing is still worth noting.
Once sharing the same space, new and old residents may or may not interact positively due to the socio-cultural lens through which each sect views the other. Often conflicts occur between residents in the early to mid-stages of gentrification when interactions between each group are new and undefined (Levy & Cybriwksy, 1980). Long-time residents often have mixed-feelings regarding the changes occurring in their neighborhood. Investment by new residents and businesses lessens the neighborhood’s isolation while also providing much needed service improvements to the area. Yet, the exuberance of new residents may cause long-time residents to lose power and influence in the local institutions that were critical to community development; essentially reframing efforts through the lens of gentrifiers (Freeman, 2006; Levy & Cybriwksy, 1980; Small, 2004). For instance, Chernoff (1980) describes the gentrification of Little Five Points in Atlanta where established business people were displaced from neighborhood institutions by new commercial investors.

The ability for residents to benefit from gentrification largely depends on if they are able to stay in the neighborhood. The large numbers of long-time resident homeowners in Clinton Hill in New York City were able to benefit from an increase in service accessibility and property values, but did not demonstrate social capital benefits through meaningful interactions with new residents (Freeman, 2006). However, studies have not shown that the increases in local tax base produced from gentrification directly benefit old residents, particularly renters, in a manner in which citizens become empowered and are able to increase their socio-economic status (Hyra, 2008).

**Solutions Towards Equitable and Sustainable Development**

In their recent text on local economic development planning, Blakely and Leigh (2010) define the practice as preserving and increasing a community’s standard of living that is sustainable in a manner which also results in reducing existing inequality (73). This formidable
task is often unrealized in gentrifying neighborhoods. Nonetheless, innovations in policies and approaches to planning within transitional neighborhoods provide a possible path towards a more equitable form of development. Both terms “equitable” and “sustainable” are vague terms that require qualification. In regards to balancing growth and equity in culturally-framed redevelopment, “equitable and sustainable development” is defined as providing appropriate measures and mechanism to mitigate the displacement of long-term residents as well as channels from which those residents can directly benefit from re-investment in their communities. Solutions towards guiding such policies fall under three main categories: market-based, locally-based, and practice-based solutions.

**Market-Based Solutions.**

Understanding that externalities within the market exacerbate existing inequalities, market-based solutions prescribe measures that encourage market actors to make provisions that directly benefit existing residents in both distressed and gentrifying communities. These are the most common solutions implemented in cities to balance growth and equity (Schwartz, 2006). Market-based solutions generally are negotiated between developers, large corporations, and cities directly where local residents and institutions may be invited to the stakeholder table at negotiations and discussions. Examples of market-based solutions include: community provisions and measures to preserve affordable housing.

**Community provisions.**

Attracting new businesses, firms, and developers to cities and particular neighborhoods has become increasingly competitive as cities bundle together incentive packages to offer firms to locate or develop in their communities. The ability for cities to negotiate incentives for development with entities also allows for the negotiation of community provisions in the type of development and level of engagement the firm will have with the neighborhood.
(Markusen, 2007). In these provisions industries attempting to open an office, factory, or other employment center may agree to employ a certain number or percentage of residents from the community. Other provisions may include a charitable donation to a local institution or a smaller-scale development project that signals the industry’s commitment to the community. In essence, community provisions aim to provide direct benefits to existing residents through negotiating contracts with incoming businesses, firms, and developers. Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) are a formal contract of community provisions a developer agrees to provide in order to mitigate potential community and to garner public support of the project by community groups. CBAs are frequently used in Washington, DC as a means for community groups from ANCs to neighborhood organizations to negotiate additional community provisions ranging from streetscaping to affordable housing provision as a result of new development (Juskus and Elia, 2007).

Issues arise in the implementation of these provisions in instances where a firm may state that not enough residents within the community meet the standard requirements to be hired. In this case, cities and communities should strive to negotiate training programs for residents. Difficulties also arise in the negotiation of community provisions. As stated above, cities often take the lead role in negotiations with major developers and industries, but do not give community institutions a seat at the table. It is imperative that community institutions ask to participate in negotiations and insist on transparency, clearly outline their stance on provisions, and mandate that an assurance of negotiated benefits be provided by the intended developer or firm (LeRoy, 2007). In some cases, community development-oriented incentive packages may inadvertently support gentrification (See discussion of Logan Circle in Chapter 4).
Preserving affordable housing.

Sustaining affordable housing in gentrifying neighborhoods is a difficult task. Cities adopt policies to incentivize the production of affordable housing within larger development projects. For example, density bonuses are granted to projects where developers agree to incorporate a particular number of affordable housing units. Typically, for each affordable unit the city will permit the construction of a larger number of market-rate units that otherwise would go beyond the restrictions of zoning and land-use density standards for the site.

The low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC) offers another avenue to aid the preservation of low-income rental housing. LIHTC is a federal subsidy that awards developers of qualified projects tax credits that can then be sold to investors to raise money for development and lowers the debt associated with construction. Overtime, investors receive a credit against their federal tax liability each year over 10 years. LIHTC has frequently been used in the redevelopment of existing public housing complexes. Limitations of LIHTCs are that the number of tax credits allocated each year is limited and that the development is not required to stay affordable in perpetuity (Schwartz, 2006).

Public housing units may also be converted to limited equity housing co-operatives in which current residents are offered a form of home ownership. Specifically, the federal government may offer to sell a public housing complex to a resident-led non-profit corporation. While residents own the stock in the non-profit corporation, they do not own their own individual unit. Most importantly, residents are given control of their own space and development. Freeman (2006) argues the significant concentration of co-op units in Clinton Hill, Brooklyn allowed long-term residents to directly benefit from gentrification.
Locally-Based Solutions.

Locally-based solutions support the growth of grassroots institutions that attempt to serve the needs of both old and new residents and preserve the ability for long-term residents to stay in the community. The primary local-based solutions include: organizing, institution development, and changing perceptions.

Organizing.

Community development and urban planning practitioners interact with wide variety of organizations at different scalar levels. Practitioners may work within the city’s planning office, neighborhood civic group, or a non-profit organizing institution. Organizing institutions develop the human and political capital within a community to guide development and even preserve affordable housing based on resident needs and desires (ONE DC, 2013).

Building institutions.

Building institutional capacity within transitional neighborhoods helps communities establish key stakeholders who can represent the needs of the community in development projects. Moreover, strong institutions can apply political pressure on city governments to provide particular benefits or provisions to community residents. Community Development Corporation (CDCs) can serve as intermediaries between local, city, national, and even global institutions to guide development in a manner that is equitable to all residents (Vidal, 1995). Communities may also establish a community land trust—a non-profit corporation that acquires and holds land to benefit the community and provide affordable housing. Community land trusts place development under the control of local residents and businesses. Recently, scholars have begun to investigate the contributions of anchor institutions to improving the quality of life in their surrounding neighborhoods (Taylor & Luter, 2013). Addressed in more detail in Chapter 5,
anchor institutions may serve various capacities within a community including schools, churches, and cultural centers.

In any institutional building initiative, practitioners should be careful to assure that local institutions collaborate with one another rather than compete with one another for resources. Competing neighborhood institutions result in a fragmented institutional capacity which allows outside forces to drive development decisions (Abbott, 2008). Finally, local institutions can build partnerships with outside non-profit groups and funding agencies to acquire additional resources for their efforts (Small, 2004).

**Changing perceptions.**

Many inner-city neighborhoods have been connoted as concentrations of crime and poverty (Grogan & Proscio, 2000; Wilson, 1996). As mentioned above, culturally-framed redevelopment identifies heritage assets within a neighborhood which can be enhanced through strategic investments (Green & Haines, 2002). In contrast, gentrifying neighborhoods have their own connotation as being edgy, cool, or hip areas where middle- and upper-income residents visit (and may live in; Zukin, 2010). In both cases, distressed and gentrifying neighborhoods may require re-orienting perceptions of how those neighborhoods are understood through the eyes of others. In doing so, the complexities of poverty and displacement become illuminated and possibly an arena where education leads to public support of programs that mitigate displacement.

**Practice-Based Solutions.**

As civil servants, urban planners engage with both local- and city-level institutions in order to meet the needs of all constituents including low- and high-income as well as old and new residents. No universal solution exists to preserve housing and social ways of life in distressed and gentrifying neighborhoods. In an effort to balance growth and equity planners
have attempted to ameliorate displacement through innovations in regulation, education, and engagement.

**Regulation.**

Adopting regulations at the city-level can serve as an immediate safeguard against displacement in communities. In addition to market-based approaches planners have developed regulatory measures to preserve affordable housing through trust funds and inclusionary zoning. Housing trust funds generate capital through local real estate taxes and other fees associated with real estate transactions to support affordable housing development and preservation. These funds are governed by a board that decides how funds should be allocated and distributed throughout the municipality. Inclusionary zoning can also be used as a regulatory tool to require developers to include a certain number of affordable homes in their development projects. Costs associated with providing affordable housing are normally offset through the use of a density bonus or other market-based solution (Schwartz, 2006). Finally, planners can incorporate objectives and goals in their development plans so that low-income housing provision remains a priority within the community (Porter & Shaw, 2009)

**Education.**

The ability to offset the externalities associated with community development and gentrification requires that planners be educated on a particular set of skills that allows them to both understand community needs and effectively negotiate with developers. Cities are increasingly in competition with one another for resources, including attracting development (Maruksen, 2007). Educating planners on negotiation and conflict management skills increases the chances that planners will be able to successfully secure community provisions. Developing positive relationships with existing neighborhood institutions also allows planners to become aware of community priorities and visions for future growth (Innes & Booher, 2010).
Engagement.

Planners cannot and should not remain objective observers to development within the communities in which they work. Innovations in the practice of planning advocate for planners to critically engage their communities on a regular basis (Sandercock, 2003; Sarkissian et al., 2010; Sarkissian and Perlgut, 1995). Rather than informing and placating residents on the potential effects of proposed development—a form of tokenism—city planning departments are creating neighborhood planning initiatives that directly involve residents in the planning process. Holding regular community meetings that allow for facilitated dialogue on community issues help both planners and community residents identify problems and solutions to those problems (Sarkissian et al., 1995). Encouraging participation and maintaining community involvement, while a challenge, is required to fully engage community members.

Producing authenticity engages a broad group of stakeholders from the city-level to the neighborhood-level in the intentional enhancement of existing or new cultural, art, and heritage assets. Through the planning process stakeholders intentionally create a narrative to be associated with the neighborhood for development and marketing purposes. Previous studies have chronicled the advent of culturally-framed redevelopment in the context of changes in societal norms and values, as a desired form of inner-city redevelopment, and its influence on interactions between new and old residents in gentrifying areas. However, few studies have comprehensively investigated the planning process of culturally-framed redevelopment to examine how the growth and equity issues outlined above are balanced within a city experiencing swift economic growth.
CHAPTER 3
THE FOUNDATION FOR CULTURALLY-FRAMED REDEVELOPMENT IN WASHINGTON, DC AND U STREET/SHAW

In the fall of 2011, I took my then 16-year-old sister-in-law and her friend to Ben’s Chili Bowl as part of their school history project to learn about local historic landmarks. They had chosen the restaurant from a list of historic landmarks provided by their teacher at a suburban private high school. The girls stayed close to me, wary of their city surroundings, as we walked up the 14th Street corridor and eastward down U Street to the largest tourist attraction on the corridor. For its first 40 years in business Ben’s Chili Bowl functioned primarily as a neighborhood eatery and there was little need for employees to police patrons. Now the long, zigzagging line to order a chili dog or half-smoke sometimes meanders around the back of the restaurant. Some current neighborhood residents actively avoid this cultural landmark—one of only three long-time black-owned businesses that remains from the neighborhood’s pre-1968 riot era (Smith, 2001). A young thirty-something resident in nearby Union Row said, “It’s always crowded there, so I hardly ever go in. I get the significance of the place, but I never have enough time to wait that long for a hot dog” (Kim, 2012).

Despite waiting in line for half an hour the girls enjoyed their chili dogs and began taking notes on the historical events I informed them occurred both inside and outside the restaurant’s walls. They were distracted by the cacophony of large numbers of tourists, identified by their matching “2012 Trip to the Nation’s Capital” shirts that jockeyed for a place to sit down or to purchase a picture of Barack Obama eating a hotdog at the counter in 2009. The recent rise in popularity of Ben’s Chili Bowl, and the U Street/Shaw neighborhood for that matter, has not

---

6 The other remaining black-owned businesses are Lee’s Flower and Card Shop at 1026 U Street, NW and Industrial Bank at 2002 11 Street, NW.
been coincidental, but an intentional outcome of culturally-framed redevelopment implemented by city, commercial and neighborhood stakeholders.

The context surrounding culturally-framed redevelopment informs how stakeholders produce and validate their interpretations of authenticity and identity in the community. An exploration of the city and neighborhood structure, respectfully, displays how issues of growth and equity have previously been addressed. This chapter outlines the context of culturally-framed redevelopment in the nation’s capital through an overview of the city’s governance structure, history, and development goals. Similarly, the particular history and political structure of U Street/Shaw influenced how the framework for redevelopment concretized in The DUKE Plan came to be supported by neighborhood residents, businesses and institutions.

**Washington, DC as a Case City: Understanding Government, Race and Class in the Nation’s Capital**

Washington, DC serves as model case city in which to study the production of authenticity through culturally-framed redevelopment. The city actively utilizes cultural assets to augment development efforts eliciting neighborhood change and gentrification. These characteristics include a strong tourism sector, recent revived interest in center city neighborhoods, and neighborhood institutions which embrace culture and heritage as assets (Bell and Jayne, 2004; Hoffman, et al., 2003).

The city’s development process is different than other municipalities due to its governance structure and relationship to the federal government. The sections below outline the governance structure of the city and its social history intimately tied to race and class as well as the balance of growth and equity.
Governance Structure and Brief History of DC City and Neighborhood Politics

The distinctive governance structure within Washington, DC has long been a point of contention between DC residents and Congress. Within its bounds the city hosts the federal enclave that consists of the National Mall, Congress, White House, and associated federal buildings. The city’s identity as the nation’s capital engenders a close and direct relationship with the federal government, yet the city’s residents are not represented in Congress. Eleanor Holmes Norton has served as the District of Columbia’s non-voting congressional delegate since 1990. She was preceded by Walter Fauntroy, a pastor and activist, from the U Street/Shaw neighborhood. Fauntroy was the first congressional delegate for the city since the late 1880s and served from 1971 to 1990 (Gillette, 1995).

The city achieved home rule 38 years ago after over 100 years of congressional oversight (Harris, 1995). Congressional oversight remains in the city in the form of budget approval and a 30-day rule for Congress to approve all city legislation. Importantly, home rule enabled residents to govern local affairs subordinate to the United States Congress (Fauntroy, 2003). Within this governance structure the city has a mayor, a thirteen-member city council, and currently 37 local advisory neighborhood commissions (ANCs). Since home rule was established the city’s mayors have generated a great deal of controversy.

Mayors.

Understanding the history of DC’s mayors displays the changing character and development purview of the city since 1973. While the city has been well-known as a Democratic Party stronghold the policy and fiscal decisions of past mayors reveal a continual attempt to increase and diversify the city’s economic base at the cost of displacing low-income residents. The city’s first mayor, Walter Washington, was largely viewed as a continuation of federal government dominance over DC local politics (Gillette, 1995). Washington’s term
concluded in 1979 when he was beaten in the Democratic Primary by Marion Barry. Marion Barry’s life and influence on DC politics has been well-documented (Jaffe & Sherwood, 1994; Gillette, 1995; Ruble, 2010). A civil rights activist who cut his teeth in DC politics through the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee headquartered on U Street, Barry experienced a meteoric rise in DC politics serving on the DC Board of Education from 1971 to 1974, DC City Council from 1974 to 1979, and as Mayor between 1979 to 1991 and 1995 to 1999. Barry’s terms as mayor focused on redeveloping the city’s downtown core to re-energize the area’s economy which had suffered since the 1968 riots. Amidst his successes, Barry’s administrations were plagued with scandals ranging from nepotism to embezzlement to drug use. In 1990, Barry was arrested in a sting operation where he was caught using crack cocaine (Jaffe & Sherwood, 1994).

During Barry’s six-month stint in federal prison, Sharon Pratt Kelly was elected Mayor. Pratt Kelly’s administration attempted to restore order and faith in DC politics, but faced hurdles over losing the NFL Redskins Football Team Stadium to nearby Landover, Maryland and a large city deficit (Gillette, 1995). During Pratt Kelly’s term, Barry was released from prison and began his political comeback in his successful election as Ward 8 City Councilman representing the highest concentration of poor, blacks in the city. Barry’s comeback was fulfilled upon his re-election as Mayor in 1994 (Jaffe & Sherwood, 1994). Barry’s political prowess and charisma, however, could not solve the dismal economic state of DC’s budget. The city’s budget estimated a 1996 fiscal deficit between $700 million and $1 billion (Barras, 1998). After one month in office Barry lobbied to Congress for help. Congress responded by forming the District of Columbia Financial Control Board that assumed authority over all of the city’s finances (Jaffe & Sherwood, 1994). Barry continually struggled with Chief Financial Officer, Anthony Williams,
and the Control Board for a decision-making role in city affairs. Frustrated, Barry did not run for re-election, but was re-elected as Ward 8 Councilman in 2002 where he continues to serve to this day.

Anthony Williams served as mayor between 1998 and 2006. Williams was not a native Washingtonian, but brought financial stability back to the city through key investments in development and real estate. By 2001, the Control Board was dissolved and the city once again had managed its own finances. Aside from fiscal responsibility, Williams’s major contribution was brokering to bring a national baseball team to the city. In 2005, the Washington Nationals began playing in a newly constructed stadium located in the Southeast neighborhood. The redevelopment of neighborhood nearby the stadium, Southwest, received mixed reviews as the area had struggled after undergoing urban renewal in the 1960s (Gillette, 1995). While William’s Administration brought the city government back into good standing, his lack of DC roots caused many long-time residents to be critical of his efforts (Nakumura, 2007). Williams announced he would not seek re-election in 2006.

Adrian Fenty was serving as Ward 4 Councilmember when he announced his candidacy for mayor in 2006. Fenty was a native Washingtonian dedicated to seeing the city progress economically. During his term between 2007 and 2011 Fenty re-structured the city’s school system by naming Michelle Rhee as school chancellor who championed school infrastructure improvements and teacher accountability. Fenty was equally aggressive in his development efforts including the redevelopment of Columbia Heights just north of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood along with the renovation of numerous libraries and parks. The rapid policy changes and expansive construction caused some DC residents to question Fenty’s allegiance to retaining long-term residents with lower incomes (DeBonis, 2009). When Fenty ran for re-
election, he found that his failure to address the base of DC politics, long-term residents, would be his downfall.

Fenty lost the 2010 mayoral election to Vincent Gray, a veteran of DC politics who had worked with Marion Barry and Sharon Pratt Kelly. Appealing to DC’s political base throughout his campaign, Gray carried the neighborhoods in DC that were majority-black on the east side of the city, while Fenty’s popularity was highest among new, wealthier residents (Marimow & Agiesta, 2010). Gray’s term has also been associated with political scandals included allegations of a shadow campaign and corruption. Members of Gray’s campaign pleaded guilty to corruption in 2011 (Suderman, 2012). Amidst the scandal Gray has indicated he will not be seeking re-election (Freed, 2013a).

City Council.

The City Council serves as the legislative body for the city. City Council members are elected as either at-large or ward members. Five members, including the chairman are elected as at-large members who are elected by the city as a whole. The remaining eight members are elected at the ward level. The city is divided into eight wards. Wards one through four are located to the west, consisting of higher-income residents while wards five through eight are on the eastside of the city that typically are inhabited by lower-income minority residents (Marimow & Agiesta, 2010). To be eligible to run for city council a candidate must be a resident of the city for at least one year prior to the election, a registered voter, and hold no other public office that generates an income (Public Law 93-198 Stat 77; DC Code Section 1-201).

Two current councilmembers, Jim Graham and Jack Evans, are pertinent to the activities and development of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood. Jim Graham was elected to City Council in 1998 representing Ward 1. Ward 1 is the smallest, but most densely populated Ward in the District. The neighborhoods that comprise Ward 1 include: Adams Morgan, Columbia Heights,
Mount Pleasant, and the U Street/Shaw neighborhood (DCOP, 2013a). Graham began his involvement in the Ward 1 community when he joined the Whitman-Walker Clinic’s Board in 1979 and became president of the board in 1981. He served as executive director from 1984 to 1999 leading the clinic to become a well-known HIV/AIDS community-based medical center. In 1987, the clinic moved from Adams Morgan to its current home on the corner of 14th and S Streets, NW in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood (Whitman-Walker, 2013). Upon his election to City Council, Jim Graham left his position at the clinic. Graham’s election marked the second openly gay official to serve on the City Council. At City Council he worked to help preserve some affordable housing in the U Street/Shaw area as well as preserve services and increase business presence along the 14th Street corridor. Graham held a coveted position as chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority Board of Directors (WMATA) in 2003 and in 2009. Graham’s support of economic development projects has drawn criticism from some residents as displacing African American long-term residents (Jones, 2005). Graham faces a difficult re-election campaign in 2014 after being formally reprimanded for violating city ethics standards for seeking a barter to win contracts for the District and the Metro system in 2008 (Craig, 2013; Sherwood, 2013)

Jack Evans represents Ward 2 in the City Council, an area that covers the Georgetown, Foggy Bottom, Dupont Circle, Logan Circle, Penn Quarter, Chinatown, Downtown, the National Mall, the White House and portions of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood (DCOP, 2013b). Thus, Ward 2 includes the majority of the tourist attractions traditionally associated with Washington, DC. Evans, a lawyer by training, was elected in 1991 during a special election and won re-election in 1992. During his tenure on the City Council, Evans supported key developments adjacent to and within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood such as the siting of Whole Foods in
Logan Circle, the Washington Convention Center and the development of a mixed-income housing complex known as City Market at O Street in Shaw (McAuley, 2013). The completed project will include 80 affordable senior rental units, 395 market-rate apartments, 145 condos as well as restaurant and retail space featuring a Giant grocery store (Nania, 2013). Evans has also been known for his dedication to maintaining fiscal responsibility and efficiency, though, Evans clashed with fellow Councilmember Jim Graham on business operations along U Street. In recent years Graham advocated for a moratorium on liquor licenses along the corridor to encourage business development unrelated to alcohol sales. Evans joined Mayor Gray and others in protesting the possible moratorium to help businesses continue to thrive (DePillis, 2010a; McAuley, 2013). On June 8, 2013, Evans announced his candidacy for mayor at the corner of 14th and Q Streets in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood. During his announcement he stated he would continue to support the economic prosperity the city had experienced in recent years while working to preserve housing and services for long-term residents (Freed, 2013a).

The Relationship between U Street/Shaw and City Politics: Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs) and Neighborhood Political Organizations.

ANCs were created as a part of the Home Rule Act as a means to involve community members in the development and policy decision-making affecting their neighborhoods. ANC's consider and make recommendations on a wide range of policies including zoning, economic development, liquor licensing, police protection, sanitation, traffic, and parking. ANC’s are comprised of a group of commissioners who are elected by the community for two-year terms. Commissioners are not paid, but are able to employ a staff for the entire commission. ANC's hold monthly meetings to discuss the various projects proposed within the neighborhood, listen to public input and provide recommendations to the appropriate government agencies associated with the proposed project or action. Similar to most public meetings, attendance to these events
vary from low turnout of less than 10 people to high turnout of over 100 people based upon the items on the ANC’s agenda. The U Street/Shaw neighborhood has three ANCs: 1B, 1C, and 2C. ANC 1B includes U Street, Howard University, Shaw and LeDroit Park. ANC 1C includes the western portion of U Street past the intersection of 14th and U Streets, Adams Morgan, Kalorama Heights and Lanier Heights. ANC 2C is comprised of Shaw, Logan Circle, Mount Vernon Square, Chinatown and Blagden Alley. ANCs serve as the center for neighborhood politics and an avenue for citizens to determine the changes that occur in their own backyards (DC ANC, 2013).

In addition to ANCs many communities have formed neighborhood or civic associations that are frequently involved in development negotiations within their boundaries (Card, 2012). In the U Street/Shaw community, the U Street Neighborhood Association and Logan Circle Community Association have become important actors in the placemaking process. The U Street Neighborhood Association was established as the Cardozo Shaw Neighborhood Association nearly 20 years ago by first-wave gentrifiers and some long-term community members. The volunteer organization, comprised mostly of first-, second- and third-wave gentrifiers meets monthly and works to improve the quality of life for residents. The Association defines the neighborhood boundaries as 16th Street to the west, 8th Street to the east, S Street to the South, and Barry Place to Florida Avenue to W Street to the North (USNA, 2013). The Association has worked to help bring in and support local businesses, listen and provide solutions to resident issues such as crime, provide residents with information on community happenings, and preserve community assets. In fact, the Association led the effort to designate the Greater U Street Historic District which finally occurred in 1998 (USNA, 2013). The Association is overseen by four volunteer officers who help coordinate the management of nine committees. Committees are

Similarly, the Logan Circle Community Association (LCCA) was founded by first-wave gentrifiers in 1972. LCCA denotes its boundaries as: S Street to the north, K Street to the south, 9th Street to the east and 16th Street to the west. The non-profit organization meets monthly to enhance quality of life and economic development, preserve the architectural integrity of the neighborhood’s Victorian homes, present recommendations to government bodies, and engage in educational activities. Most notably, the LCCA hosts an annual house tour that allows interested parties to tour traditional and contemporary neighborhood homes during the holiday season (LCCA, 2013). LCCA is composed of a loose organizational structure of officers and volunteers.

Key neighborhood stakeholders also include Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and Business Associations. BIDs are commercial areas where property owners approve assessments for services above city provisions. Additional services offered by BIDs may range from increased cleaning, security, programming, and planning. BIDs are non-profit entities typically managed by a Board of Directors (DC BID Council, 2013). Councilmember Jim Graham suggested the 14th and U Street corridors consider establishing a BID, but this has yet to find support (Nadeau, 2012). Business Associations are much more prevalent than BIDs. These neighborhood-based non-profit organizations are an agglomeration of local businesses that pool resources through annual dues to maintain and improve the area’s business climate. The Mid-City Business Association was founded for U Street/Shaw businesses in 1998. The Association organized events such as the Mid-City Dog Days sidewalk sale to increase business in the neighborhood. The Association went dormant in 2012 at which time local businesses gathered
together to continue the Mid-City Dog Days event (Gomez, 2012; Hay, 2012). Table 3-1 below illustrates how city and neighborhood-governance is structured in Washington, DC, using U Street/Shaw as an example:

Table 3-1: Governance Structure of U Street/Shaw in Washington, DC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Organizations</th>
<th>Neighborhood Organizations</th>
<th>ANCs</th>
<th>City Council Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Street/Shaw</td>
<td>U Street Neighborhood Association, Logan Circle Community Association, Meridian Hill Neighborhood Association, ONE DC</td>
<td>ANC 1B, 1C, 2C</td>
<td>Jim Graham (Ward1) Jack Evans (Ward 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Source, Author.

ANCs, neighborhood and business organizations play an integral role in negotiating development within Washington, DC neighborhoods through Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs). CBAs are contracts agreed upon between developers and community groups where the developer agrees to provide certain amenities in exchange for community support of a proposed project. The first CBA in Washington, DC occurred in 2005 within the Shaw community and was brokered by the affordable housing advocacy organization, ONE DC (Juskus & Elia, 2007). ONE DC found that CBAs provided leverage for community’s to directly benefit from major development projects. Each ANC and neighborhood organization have actively worked with developers in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood to negotiate CBAs that improve service and amenities in the neighborhood in exchange for their support of major retail and housing projects (Card, 2012; Nadeau, 2012; Pomeroy, 2012). The structure of city and neighborhood politics creates a climate that values growth as an opportunity to improve additional neighborhood
amenities and support the diversification of the city’s economy. The pro-growth governance structure has been influenced and continues to directly affect the development of the city along racial and class-based lines.

**Washington, DC: A City Developed along lines of Race and Class and the Federal Government**

As referenced earlier, Washington, DC’s history is integrally tied to the federal government. In his history of the city, Gillette (1995) chronicles the tensions that have continued to surround the development of the nation’s capital. Based on a deal struck between Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, the 68.3 square miles that now comprise the District of Columbia was founded in 1790, but was not officially the functioning home of the federal government until 1800 (Gillette, 1995, 12). From that point on the city suffered from an identity crisis. Was it simply a federal district or a full-fledged city? While the founders had hoped that the city would develop into an industrial and major trading post this did not occur. Rather, the federal government became the primary enterprise within the city. The city stumbled under a brief period of Home Rule under Boss Shepherd in the late 1800s during which the city accumulated millions of dollars in debt. During this time, the city’s freed black population became one of the largest in the nation. These early social dynamics continued to frame development, demography and politics in the city.

Neighborhood development according to Pierre L’Enfant’s Plan for the nation’s capital was a slow process. Pierre L’Enfant was commissioned by President Washington to design the capital city in 1791. His plan included a street grid with streets running east-west and north-south, respectively. Diagonal avenues named after the nation’s states would create intersections of circles and plazas for open space. L’Enfant also designed a grand avenue that would eventually become the National Mall (Gillette, 1995). At the time the city was comprised of
large areas of swampland and not much infrastructure, causing few people to rushing to live in the District of Columbia when L’Enfant’s vision was being constructed. Washington, DC became the first black-majority city during the Civil War as freedmen and refugees fled into the city limits (Ruble, 2010). By the early 1900s massive civic improvements improved the image of the city resulting in the development of multiple neighborhoods such as Mount Pleasant and Capitol Hill. Georgetown was already established prior to the city’s founding. Residential settlement became more segregated over time as suburban neighborhoods drew whites further away from the city center. Many white neighborhoods had enacted restrictive covenants to keep minorities, namely blacks and Jews, out of their residential areas. Blacks were also found living in dilapidated alley housing that had not been updated for decades (Borchert, 1980). An effort to correct the substandard alley housing was eventually undertaken during the progressive era of the 1930s and 40s (Gillette, 1995, 32). Nevertheless, racial segregation was in place and maintained despite the high number of blacks in the city.

**White Flight and Disinvestment: Contextualizing 1950 to 1990 Washington, DC.**

After restrictive covenants were outlawed in 1948, white residents moved to the outer edges of the city leaving the center city as black-majority neighborhoods. White flight occurred during the 1950s and 60s due to the surge in homeownership possibilities for middle-income families. Most white households in the city chose to move to the suburbs outside of Washington, DC in Virginia and Maryland (Gale, 1987). During the 1950s, the city implemented its first attempt at urban renewal, specifically in the southwest quarter. The razing of neighborhood homes and industrial spaces were replaced by sterile office and residential buildings that did not attract higher-income residents or tourists. The Southwest Urban Renewal Project came to live in infamy for its inability to solve the issue of so-called urban blight while also exacerbating
perceptions of the area as dangerous through the construction of major highway overpasses (Gillette, 1995).

Black middle-class flight followed white flight in the 1960s causing the majority of Washington, DC inner-city neighborhoods to be predominantly poor and minority-majority areas. The decline of the inner-city and frustration with racial inequity culminated in the 1968 riots that occurred along the U Street corridor and other majority-black neighborhoods (Bean, 2000). The riots resulted in nearly 1,200 injuries, the destruction of over 600 buildings, the closure of 900 businesses, and the unemployment of thousands of residents (WAMU, 2010). David Gale (1987) traces the demographic shifts that occurred during white flight and subsequent inner-city revitalization efforts within the city until 1980. Gale (1987) found that between 1950 and 1980 DC’s population declined significantly. Other demographic shifts during this period included a decline in household size, increased amount of poverty compared to the city’s suburbs, and a larger adult and aging population (19). Areas that were targeted for revitalization were located within the northwest sections of the city. Since the 1970s when these areas were redeveloped the Northwest population has witnessed an influx of higher-educated and white residents. In comparison, black majority neighborhoods display lesser degrees of educational attainment and lower income earnings. The city’s neighborhoods continued to decline throughout the 1970s and early 1980s. Development progress was reignited during the late 1980s and 1990s through redevelopment of the downtown core and infrastructure improvements. Large-scale redevelopment of these inner-city neighborhoods began to attract young professionals.

Scholars who study segregation in residential settlement patterns often calculate the dissimilarity index to determine the level of segregation within a particular area. The
dissimilarity index is a measure of the evenness with which two groups (e.g. whites and non-whites) are distributed across space. The index score is understood as the percentage of one population that would have to move to a different location in order to have an even distribution of both groups. Washington, DC’s black/white dissimilarity index has not changed significantly between 1990 and 2000 with the score only decreasing two percentage points from 65.1 to 63.1 (Squires et al., 2002, 160). Racial inequality remains, as do discriminatory practices in housing. Squires et al. (2002) analyzed a telephone survey of Washington, DC residents to find that blacks were nearly twice as likely as whites not to get their first housing choice when they purchased their homes. More importantly, the results of a 1997 Fair Housing Council paired test survey found that black renters experienced discrimination 44% of the time while blacks wanting to purchase a home experienced similar discrimination 33% of the time (Squires et al., 2002, 163).

**The Effect of Redevelopment on Race, Class and a Right to the Stay in the City, 1990 to Present.**

Within the past ten years Washington, DC has witnessed a rebirth that resulted in mixed-use and large-scale redevelopment, historic preservation, and a renewed demand for city life by young urban professionals and families. For example, between 2008 and 2009 6,550 new residents moved to the city increasing housing demand which caused a rise in cost of living and housing prices (Kummer, 2011). The city’s current economy continues to rely upon the presence of the federal government, but also draws heavily upon tourism. In 2011, the city population was estimated to be 617,996 whereas the number of annual visitors to the city totaled 17.9 million and generated $6.03 billion in spending. Within the city, tourism spending is responsible for $3.06 billion of wages and 76,256 jobs each year (DeBonis, 2011; Destination DC, 2012).

Between 2000 and 2010 the city’s black population dropped 11 percent, roughly 1 percent per year. A once strongly black-majority city, the city’s black population is now barely
50 percent. The influx of white residents suggests the city is undergoing massive demographic shifts indicative of gentrification and increased demands for affordable housing for long-term residents (Morello & Keating, 2011).

Within the District of Columbia, housing demand is historically associated with established neighborhoods and neighborhoods that are the targets of revitalization. Many DC newcomers are attracted to well-known neighborhoods such as Georgetown and Dupont Circle in the city’s northwest section, but find they cannot afford the cost of living. As a result, newcomers are moving into transitional areas such as Columbia Heights, Mount Pleasant, and Shaw (Kummer, 2011). Galster and Tatian (2009) conducted a hazard model analysis to determine when less advantaged areas of the city would have upsurges in housing prices using Washington, DC as a case city. They found that spatial spillovers are often the cause of price increases. Neighborhoods adjacent to areas that already had high housing prices were more likely to have an upsurge in prices than other areas. Locations adjacent to existing neighborhoods such as Capitol Hill and Dupont Circle are attracting newcomers and threatening the ability for existing low-income residents to stay in the neighborhood.

Affordability in Washington, DC is now an issue for middle- and low-income residents. Since 2000, rents in the District have grown more quickly than rents in other cities and even more quickly than the incomes of many DC residents (DC Fiscal Policy Institute, 2010, 1). Causes for this affordable housing crisis are attributed to externalities of revitalization and gentrification. The housing stock that serves the low-income community has decreased by a third over the past ten years. During the same time period the number of low cost homes has decreased by two-thirds. Almost one-sixth of DC residents, totally roughly 100,000 people, are facing unaffordable housing expenses. Four out of five households with incomes less than 30 percent of
the average median income (AMI) spend more than 30 percent of their income on their housing.\(^7\) Low-income residents of the city have the largest affordability issues as 85% of households with severe housing cost issues have household incomes less than 50% AMI (DC Fiscal Policy Institute, 2010, 8).

Gentrification has caused a rapid increase in housing costs and is associated with a decrease in low-income residents and an increase in higher-income residents. Low-income residents are dealing with depleted resources on two fronts that often cause them to move to inner-ring suburbs. While the rental stock that previously served them is being replaced with owner-occupied housing, federally and locally-funded affordable housing programs and housing units are diminishing (DC Fiscal Policy Institute, 2010).

**U Street/Shaw as a Case Study: The History and Redevelopment of “Black Broadway”**

Within this study, U Street/Shaw serves one of the first examples of black, culturally-framed development executed in Washington, DC. Redevelopment began in U Street/Shaw during the 1990s and the neighborhood is currently considered gentrified (Ruble, 2010). As a result, the neighborhood has undergone a shift in political and neighborhood leadership and the stakeholders that currently manage the maintenance of culturally-framed redevelopment projects.

**The Rise and Fall of U Street/Shaw From 1760 to 1990**

U Street/Shaw was not a part of the original L’Enfant Plan for Washington, DC. Prior to 1760, the expanse of land that would become U Street/Shaw was nothing more than a patch of wooded land on the outskirts of the future capital of the United States. The area experienced intense growth during the Civil War as U Street/Shaw became a camp for the large amount of freed African Americans and refugees who fled to the capital in the 1860s. As more African Americans...

\(^7\) In 2009, the AMI for Washington, DC was $56,519. (American Factfinder, 2009) Also, the federal housing affordability standard is 30% of the household’s income (Schwartz, 2006).
Americans settled near U Street/Shaw services such as hospitals were established to provide services to residents. In addition, Congress recognized the need for transportation improvements and began to construct railroad and street car routes along the 7th Street and 14th Street corridors. In 1867, Howard University was founded within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood to provide higher-level educational opportunities for African Americans. While the university was open to all races, the majority of students were black (Smith, 2001).

Between the 1880s and 1920, the U Street/Shaw neighborhood, then colloquially referred to as Mid-City or Uptown, continued developing residential and commercial spaces that attracted a mix of races, cultures, and social classes. Despite a diverse population, geographic sections of the neighborhood were racialized as whites typically lived along street car routes while blacks resided within the central blocks of the neighborhood. After 1901, city government legal codes promoted further segregation within Washington, DC. Within 20 years, U Street/Shaw became a mixed-class, black neighborhood. For example, between 1886 and 1920, the number of black-owned businesses increased from 15 to 300 (Williams, 2003, 7).

U Street/Shaw’s identity as a segregated black neighborhood in the early 20th century is associated with a tremendous period of cultural growth and recognition for the corridor. Between 1910 and 1948, the neighborhood gained its “Black Broadway” reputation. The moniker, “Black Broadway,” was coined by Pearl Bailey to describe the corridor in the 1920s (Williams, 2003). As the city’s premiere black entertainment district, U Street/Shaw, hosted Duke Ellington’s first public performance, influential scholars from nearby Howard University, musicians, artists, and writers (Ruble, 2010). Institutions such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Urban League, United Order of True Reformers, various churches, and the Industrial Bank became key community organizations. The Whitelaw Hotel, Howard
Theatre, Lincoln Theatre, and Bohemian Caverns each hosted local jazz musician Ella Fitzgerald and other nationally-known musical and theatrical acts. The neighborhood was also a center for political progress towards racial equality. Thurgood Marshall often used the 12th Street YMCA building for meeting space to discuss his efforts to promote civil rights legislation changes.

While U Street/Shaw maintained a middle-class reputation through its connection to Howard University and the cultural jazz scene, the neighborhood was comprised of poor, working-class, middle-class, and wealthy residents. In his seminal work on U Street/Shaw, Blair Ruble (2010) describes how the corridor, particularly during the “Black Broadway” period served as a “zone of contact” between divergent groups that normally would not have interacted with one another creating a space of creativity, identity formation, and progress for residents, the neighborhood, and the city as a whole. The intermingling of various classes of the black community as well as other races as they met at the Cotillion Room at the Lincoln Theatre or interacted at Howard University served as critical meeting contact spaces between normally separated social groups (WAMU, 2010).

The restrictive covenants that kept African Americans segregated in the U Street/Shaw area and other neighborhoods throughout Washington, DC were overturned by the Supreme Court in 1948 by the Shelley vs. Kraemer decision (Williams, 2003). The decision allowed many affluent Black residents to move to other areas of the city or outlying suburbs. As a result, U Street/Shaw’s economy began to deteriorate. Poverty and drugs became increasingly prevalent throughout the 1950s and 60s. While the community maintained its hold as a black business corridor, the type of customer who frequented these establishments became a lower-income resident who had less expendable income.
During the 1960s, the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) honed in on Shaw neighborhood for an urban renewal project. The Shaw Urban Renewal Area written by NCPC established the neighborhood’s name as Shaw and also put the neighborhood in the direct path of bulldozers. Planners and officials desired to employ pro-growth approaches in the neighborhood to develop Shaw into a high-income neighborhood and retail area. Wary of urban renewal since the failed attempt in Southwest, community stakeholders jumped into action. In 1960, Howard University students and professors met with local clergy members to respond to government recommendations for the renewal project. Walter Fauntroy, then a pastor at New Bethel Baptist Church, eventually took on the lead role in opposing renewal by forming the Model Inner-City Community Organization (MICCO). MICCO was able to cease the renewal plans for the Shaw neighborhood. Instead, Fauntroy and fellow MICCO members merged various federal grants to improve the area through a neighborhood development group model (Ruble, 2010). MICCO’s success helped the U Street/Shaw neighborhood conserve its identity. At the same time, it also became constrained by it. Over time, the corridor was regarded as simply another low-income, black neighborhood in Washington, DC (Williams, 2003).

In April 1968, U Street/Shaw was telecast across the United States as crowds gathered at the intersection of 14th and U Streets to grieve the loss of Martin Luther King, Jr. The crowds became agitated and a violent riot erupted throughout the U Street corridor. Local activist and black militant, Stokely Carmichael described the three-day riot and its associated riots throughout the nation as “uprisings against poverty and white racism” (Bean, 2000, 165). The physical destruction to the corridor was equated to the aftermath of a war zone (Smith, 2001). Commercial buildings along the U Street and 14th Street corridor were trashed, vandalized, and, in some cases, burned to the ground.
Despite national attention, the aftermath of the riot resulted in the continual decline of business along the U Street corridor. Few historical accounts of U Street/Shaw provide details for the period between 1968 and 1990. Newspaper and historical accounts argue the area experienced a great decline after the 1968 riots only to eventually become the target of redevelopment efforts during the late 1980s and 1990s (Ault, 2006; Lerner, 2010; Ruble, 2010; Smith, 2001). U Street/Shaw’s nadir after the 1968 riots is similar to many inner-city neighborhoods that suffered high rates of prostitution, drugs, and drug-related crime during the 1970s and 1980s (Christensen, 2012; Pomeroy, 2012). Redevelopment efforts in U Street/Shaw during the 1980s to the present have considered the area’s history as a marketing tactic for pro-growth initiatives aimed to attract tourists and new residents.

**The Culturally-Framed Redevelopment of “Black Broadway,” 1990s-Present**

Historic preservation of landmarks coupled with infrastructure improvements, including the siting of two metro stations, marked the rebirth of the U Street corridor. In 1986 the Franklin D. Reeves Municipal Center was opened by then-Mayor Marion Barry at the corner of 14th and U illustrating the city’s commitment to revitalizing the corridor. Soon after in 1991 two metro stops opened in the neighborhood—U Street/Cardozo and Shaw/Howard University improving access to the downtown core (Ruble, 2010). At the same time, the city and local historians were working to preserve the historic landmarks in the neighborhood focusing on the “Black Broadway” period between 1900 and 1948. This narrative came to frame future development efforts within the neighborhood.

**The Duke Plan: creating a cultural destination district.**

In 2005, the City Council adopted *The DUKE Plan*, to develop the U Street/Shaw neighborhood into a cultural destination district. The plan focuses on creating multiple neighborhoods within neighborhoods that can serve as small-scale attractions. For example,
cultural landmarks such as the Howard and Lincoln Theatres serve as anchors for destinations, plazas and transit-oriented development (DCOP, 2005). The plan suggests developing new housing surrounding cultural destinations as well as specifying the need for social preservation in the form of affordable housing to mitigate the displacement of long-term residents (DCOP, 2005). Since its adoption *The DUKE Plan* has served as the vision for the U Street/Shaw community for the city and community stakeholders (Callcott, 2011; Card, 2012; Nadeau, 2012).

![Figure 3-2: Cover of *The DUKE Plan*. From: DCOP, 2005, 1.](image)

**Growth and equity policy goals.**

The plan addressed growth and equity through various policy goals. The vision outlined for the neighborhood combined the enhancement of the historic fabric of buildings and African American landmarks with mixed-use development to create a neighborhood that would serve residents and also attract outsiders as an entertainment destination (DCOP, 2005, 4). Growth strategies included establishing a mixed, use destination development program between two major theatres, the Lincoln and the Howard, through rezoning properties, condemning nuisance
properties, increasing taxes on vacant properties, pushing for new construction on empty lots, and incentivizing rehabilitation of housing stock through first-time homebuyer tax credits (DCOP, 2005; Franke-Ruta, 2012).

Cultural preservation was used to frame the growth strategies within the DUKE Plan while also serving as a strategy to maintain equity within the neighborhood. The plan purposefully chose to market a particular narrative of U Street/Shaw’s history—that of the “Black Broadway” period between 1920 and 1950. This particular period was characterized as a time in the early 20th century where:

The overall racial climate in Washington inspired a new ideology among African Americans that transformed U Street into a self-sufficient community and the center of African American life. A group of rising middle-class black entrepreneurs rejected the traditional approach of gaining racial equality through civil rights advocacy and proposed instead an idea of racial solidarity and self-sufficiency (DCOP, 2005, 6).

As an equitable strategy, cultural preservation gave appropriate homage to the residents’ history of the community at the time the plan was adopted. The plan also suggested developing new housing surrounding cultural destinations as well as specifying the need for social preservation in the form of affordable housing to mitigate the displacement of long-term residents (DCOP, 2005). Combined, inclusivity through cultural preservation and housing seemed to positively accommodate existing resident concerns about the possibility of neighborhood gentrification (DCOP, 2005, 5). One key policy outlined in the plan noted that promoting cultural tourism based on the African American history in the neighborhood would engender economic development opportunities to existing local residents and businesses (DCOP, 2005, 12; DCOP, 2012, 1). The politics of the implementation, or lack thereof, of this recommendation are examined in Chapter 6.
A scalar approach to creating a cultural destination.

In order to transform U Street/Shaw into a cultural destination, The DUKE Plan provides redevelopment plans that address various scales of placemaking outlined from largest to smallest as: the neighborhood, sub-areas, and residents. At the neighborhood scale emphasis was placed on creating and supporting the association between the neighborhood and its African American heritage, primarily the “Black Broadway” period (DCOP, 2005, 6-7). The implications of these efforts will be discussed in the following chapter.

The creation of sub-areas/sub-districts (the plan uses these terms interchangeably) provided small area projects that the city could address in a piecemeal fashion with the partnership of private developers and community stakeholders. The plan divides the U Street/Shaw neighborhood into six distinct zones that displayed the potential to be redeveloped into various cultural destinations along the neighborhood’s major corridors. The division of the neighborhood into six zones illustrates how The DUKE Plan employs the clustering of cultural and heritage investments throughout the neighborhood to create a cultural destination district (See Chapter 4 for more on clusters and districts). The plan emphasized development along the neighborhood’s main thoroughfares of U Street, NW, Florida Avenue, NW, 7th Street, NW and 9th Street, NW. The six sub-areas slated for redevelopment and improvements included: Lincoln Commons, the African American Civil War Memorial, Howard Town Center Area, 9th Street, Howard Theatre District, and Rhode Island Avenue (See Figure 3-2 below).
As mentioned above, the Howard Theatre and the Lincoln Theatre were identified as anchors for the sub-area redevelopment projects which will be elaborated in Chapter 5. Each sub-area contained specific recommendations to create places tied to the neighborhood’s history that would bring in new residents and visitors. The Howard Theatre sub-area was envisioned to become a live entertainment anchor with a refurbished Howard Theatre and plazas for conviviality and open air dining. The entertainment destination would be paired with the development of mixed-use housing and retail. The 9th Street Sub-District would be re-imagined with eclectic shops, dining and entertainment (DCOP, 2005, 22).

The Rhode Island Avenue Sub District would attract new residents to the gateway of U Street/Shaw through the redevelopment of Parcel 42 located on the corner of 7 St, NW and Rhode Island Avenue. In April 2013, the city announced that the city-owned property would be developed into a 105-unit residential building with retail space on the ground floor. Twenty percent of the units would be set aside as affordable housing (Urban Turf, 2013). Another project
completed for the Rhode Island Avenue Sub-District was the renovation of the Watha T. Daniel Public Library. The library underwent redevelopment and was opened to the public in August 2010 (Prince of Petworth, 2010b).

Envisioned as a cultural arts center, the African American Civil War Memorial Sub-district would be a civic and cultural gateway to the community. Key sites for redevelopment included the Grimke Elementary School located adjacent to the African American Civil War Museum that opened at the corner of Vermont Avenue and U Street, NW in January 1999. The museum educates the public on the United States Colored Troops that served in the Civil War (AACWMM, 2013).

The Howard Town Center Area Sub-District was outlined to serve as a compliment to the other sub-areas developed in partnership with Howard University. The plan emphasizes the development of more mixed-use housing and retail in addition to leveraging the success of the nearby music club, the 9:30 Club. Finally, the Lincoln Common Sub-District bookends the cultural destination district through streetscaping improvements along the U Street corridor that welcome residents to neighborhood attractions such as the Lincoln Theatre and Ben’s Chili Bowl (DCOP, 2005).

Community engagement and resident benefits.

The city engaged over 500 residents in the planning process of The DUKE Plan suggesting that the city, knowing the neighborhood’s history for resisting redevelopment, understood the value residents placed on their neighborhood and its identity. Emphasis on community-based needs and amenities are mentioned throughout the plan in partnership with a dedication to preserving the African American cultural and historical assets (DCOP, 2005).

The direct benefits for community members outlined in the plan centered on affordable housing, employment and entrepreneurship. The plan recommends 20 to 30 percent of housing
units on large parcels, including Parcel 42, should be set aside for affordable housing. Other housing recommendations focus on providing pathways for Section 8 voucher recipients to own their own homes, creating additional affordable housing complexes, use tax increment financing to support affordable housing, and expand affordable housing on other key parcels (DCOP, 2005, 46). The city centered its employment and entrepreneurship recommendations on partnerships with 14th and U Street Main Streets (which went dormant in 2005) and Shaw Main Streets programs. These organizations were viewed as mediators in helping local businesses find local employees (DCOP, 2005; Pomeroy, 2012).

The preservation of African American cultural assets was viewed as a critical benefit to community members who expressed a desire to celebrate and share the history of the community. In this capacity, Cultural Tourism DC (CTDC) was identified as the lead agent for helping local organizations coordinate heritage programming and preservation efforts (DCOP, 2005, 42). Cultural Tourism DC was founded in 1996 by local historian Kathy Smith who was then working to chronicle the history of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood through national historic landmark applications and the development of a heritage trail project (Smith, 2008). CTDC will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4. However, it is important to note that since its founding, the organization has blossomed from a small, grassroots operation to a multi-faceted non-profit tourism organization producing city-wide tourism events that emphasize the history of the city’s neighborhoods. The organization is now housed in the same office space as the city’s official tourism branch, Destination DC (Wheeler, 2012). Former Director of Marketing, Pat Wheeler (2012) commented on the organization’s relationship to the city as:

Destination DC, they make the promise to come to DC and then we [CTDC] deliver on the promise because our members are the ones that deliver the promise and provide the wonderful events and attractions that are here in the city. So we work a lot with Destination DC. We work with them on citywide promotion.
The DUKE Plan recommended continuing engagement with community members to assure cultural preservation continued in a manner that community members could support and approve (DCOP, 2005, 42). Outside of these specific recommendations no other form of agency was outlined for the community to help negotiate the preservation and marketing of the neighborhood’s history to the general public.

**Outcomes of The DUKE Plan in U Street/Shaw.**

Since the adoption of the DUKE Plan, the U Street/Shaw neighborhood has developed into a desirable residential neighborhood with an entertainment district and tourist attractions. Though, the neighborhood’s cost of living continues to rise forcing some long-term residents to move out of the area. Affordable housing complexes remain along the 7th Street, NW corridor, but continue to be threatened by redevelopment or conversion to market-rate housing (ONE DC, 2013). Despite the recent progress, it took a significant period of time redevelopment projects to begin in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood. The neighborhood was still recovering in the 1990s from the Metro construction that decimated what had remained of the U Street business corridor.

Project planning continued into the early 2000s when development plans began to be cemented with public-private partnerships. In 2007, the National Housing Institute’s publication *Shelterforce* commented on the impact the realization of The DUKE Plan would ultimately have on the neighborhood:

> Named after Duke Ellington, the proposed plan aimed to attract new investment to Shaw by drawing from the area’s rich cultural history. The commodification of early 20th century black culture, and the lure of prime, central-city property is a sure sign that gentrification will finds its way to 7th Street (Juskus & Elia, 2007).

Since 2007 U Street/Shaw’s corridors have been marked by construction cranes and news of affordable housing complexes changing over to market-rate apartments. Demographic shifts and continued community buy-in display an on-going commitment to The DUKE Plan vision.
The U Street/Shaw neighborhood had undergone a significant period of gentrification between 1990 and 2013 that is evidenced by the area’s demographics. The neighborhood’s population increased by over 6,000 between 1980 and 2010 during which time the city’s overall population decreased by over 36,000 (U.S. Census, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010). The community has also experienced racial demographic change. In 1970 the neighborhood was 86% black and 12% white. Today, the neighborhood is 52% white and 30% black (U.S. Census, 1970, 2010). This statistic combined with the fact that the median borrower income increased by $58,817 (in 2006$) between 1997 and 2006 suggests that the area underwent gentrification during the planning and implementation of culturally-framed development as outlined in *The DUKE Plan* (NeighborhoodInfo DC, 2012; Smith, 1998). The influx of market rate development on the 14th Street and 7th Street corridors indicates that affordable housing units are not being replaced in a timely manner which will cause the displacement of many long-term residents.

Community buy-in of *The DUKE Plan* remains strong among residents and neighborhood organizations. Scott Pomeroy, who moved to his house on 13th Street nearly 25 years ago was an active community leader who participated in the planning process. According to Scott, the plan solidified actions already occurring in the neighborhood:

Scott: We’ve [the U Street/Shaw community] had good planning process. I mean *The Duke Plan* was a good planning process. It was horribly timed because it came in after we had already established the 14th and U Main Street program and the Shaw Main Street program doing what *The Duke Plan* was advocating doing. But they created a planning process, hired consultants to manage it, and then basically regurgitated what were already in the work plans that the community had put together. We had to make sure that it followed the same priorities that were already established in the community. So it really fought against the community plans and visions and processes moving forward and sucked the energy out of those so that it could have a nice glossy document to say, “This is what we would like to do!” You want a few copies? I’ve got plenty extra ones (Pomeroy, 2012).
Even though *The DUKE Plan* spun the wheels of community groups already involved in cultural preservation and community improvements, the city’s efforts provided a formal document that city, commercial and community stakeholders throughout the entire U Street/Shaw neighborhood could look to for guidance in the years to come. *The DUKE Plan* became *the* vision for U Street/Shaw that community leaders referenced during development reviews and the negotiation of community benefits agreements. Knowledge of the plan also became a point of cultural or political capital among active community residents expressed by Brianne Nadeau and Brian Card, both active in neighborhood organizations, below.

**Brianne:** But, it [*The DUKE Plan*] comes up I think when somebody is trying to develop something, which is when it should come up. And you know, to be like, well, that’s not a part of *The DUKE Plan*, or that is a part of *The DUKE Plan*. So for example, the Grimke School which is down that way, when they were redeveloping it, one of the arguments being made was this was part of *The DUKE Plan*...the only time it came up on the commission [ANC 1B] was when the Grimke School was being redeveloped and people were advocating for it to be developed as the plan has prescribed. Which was good. I mean, that would have been a good. They didn’t end up doing any of it (Nadeau, 2012).

**Brian:** I asked some potential runners for the ANC 1B seat, I asked one guy, do you know about *The DUKE Plan*? “No, what is that?” It’s kind of funny I think. They should at least know about that document and what it is (Card, 2012).

The towering construction cranes and marketing associated with U Street/Shaw display the success of *The DUKE Plan*. City residents and tourists now flock to the area as one of the must-see neighborhoods in the city for its cultural history and entertainment. While the demographics have changed, the identity associated with U Street/Shaw has remained African American. The transition from majority-minority neighborhood to a majority white neighborhood has direct repercussions on who consumes and interacts with the “Black Broadway” place-based identity.

**Effects of Gentrification: The Changing Faces and Politics of U Street/Shaw**

In her work chronicling the white flight and black flight in one inner-city neighborhood, Rachael Woldoff (2011) explains that neighborhood culture is shaped by who the neighborhood
attracts, who stays and who leaves. In essence, a people make a place and shape its identity. The people who came to live in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood since the beginning of its redevelopment have come to define the neighborhood. As groups of residents moved into the neighborhood social groups formed and changed the face of U Street/Shaw along with the neighborhood’s politics. Similar to Woldoff’s (2011) findings, the impacts of U Street/Shaw’s growth is displayed through social, economic and cultural differences within the successive waves of gentrification.

**Three Waves of Gentrification in U Street/Shaw.**

Gentrification in U Street/Shaw occurred in three major waves of new resident settlement. Long-term residents are not considered as a wave of the gentrification process. Rather, long-term residents are understood as the indigenous community to the neighborhood. As will be discussed in later chapters, long-term residents are identified by themselves and by new residents as the population most closely associated with the African American historical significance of the neighborhood. It is important to note that early white pioneers did move to portions of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood prior to the 1990s. For example, white pioneers moved to the Logan Circle neighborhood as early as the 1970s. For the purposes of this study, however, the successive waves of settlement just prior and after the opening of the Metro Stations on U Street, NW and 7th Street, NW in 1991 are the most significant for understanding gentrification related to the culturally-framed redevelopment effort.

**First-wave gentrifiers: early to late 1990s.**

The first wave of gentrifiers moved to the U Street/Shaw neighborhood attracted largely by the area’s low housing costs. Many new residents were young professionals on small salaries just starting their careers. At the time the neighborhood still was host to a high level of gang,
drug, and crime activities. As such, new residents to the neighborhood exhibited a sense of either adventure or stupidity as described by first-wave gentrifier, Scott Pomeroy (2012):

**Scott:** Uh, well, no I got shot at once here. Saw somebody get shot at the front of the church. So for the first decade I was here this lot across the way was an abandoned hospital.

**Allison:** Why did you choose to move here?

**Scott:** The metro was under construction and I lived in Philadelphia and went to school in inner-city downtown so I wasn’t intimidated by the area. Probably too young and stupid to know better at that time. Uh, cause I would have a dozen prostitutes on the corner and pick up heroin needles out of the yard on a daily basis. Um, neighbors have changed. . .I have been on the block, longest on the block. There were a lot more young kids when I first moved in. A lot of those I saw get into a whole lot of trouble. If you have ever seen *The Wire* and the student side of that? I lived through a whole lot that reminds me of *The Wire*. Then ended up with a lot of seniors were the ones that were holding onto things and then when they passed, their children went ahead and sold them.

Some first-wave gentrifiers have also moved out of the neighborhood in recent years as the property values on their homes have raised dramatically. Scott, for instance, just recently put his home on the market. A number of first-wave gentrifiers got involved in community planning and decision-making to improve the neighborhood. Scott was a former U Street Neighborhood Association President, served as the first director of the 14th and U Street Main Street Alliance, served on the ANC 1B Commission and worked at one time for Councilmember Jim Graham.

Many first-wave residents are astounded by how far the neighborhood has come, but continue to see room for improvements. In particular, many residents like Scott are concerned about the displacement of affordable housing residents in the near future (Pomeroy, 2012). The neighborhood culture of first-wavers included a focus on improving their homes and their neighborhood through a somewhat mediated engagement with their neighbors. Most first-wave residents were on friendly terms with their neighbors, but did have difficulty policing the gang-, drug- and prostitution-related activity in their neighborhoods.
Second-wave gentrifiers: late 1990s to early 2000s.

The majority of second-wave gentrifiers have lived in the neighborhood for over ten years. Most second-wavers moved to the neighborhood due to the affordability of the housing stock. Moreover, many second-wave gentrifiers moved into the neighborhood as the area was just beginning to be well-known as metro-accessible. Second-wave gentrifiers generally fall into three lifestyles: gay pioneers, young urban professionals (civically active and non-active), and musically-oriented residents. While many residents could identify across groups, these descriptions serve as ideal types.

U Street/Shaw was viewed as an affordable alternative to more pricey neighborhoods such as Dupont Circle, which was established as the city’s gay core beginning in the early 1970s (CTDC, 2008). A large proportion of first- and second-wave gentrifiers were members of the gay community who wanted to live as close to Dupont Circle as they could afford. The current president of the U Street Neighborhood Association moved to his house across from Grimke School precisely for that reason. Brian (2012) noted his motivations for moving into the neighborhood as well as his interactions and feelings towards some long-term residents:

Brian: My mom was born and raised at 16th and V. I grew up in the military, but I was born here and we came back during the summers. So my whole kind of exposure to DC was you know after the decline. You know, and I am kind of amazed and I do sometimes wonder like, am I going to really gel with this neighborhood? Because when I moved back all my friends, we drew this line, I wanted to live in Dupont, so they drew this line and they said you can’t go over 15th Street so I found an apartment at 13th and T. 23 years ago and rented there and wouldn’t cross across S or T cause you would get mugged and there wasn’t that much in that area and the metro just newly been put in. And you didn’t really think about much stuff like that because it was what I could afford and then I end up going to the Hill for a little bit and bought a house there and I knew H Street because I was always…and then I moved back 13 or 14 years ago and bought the house I live in now.

It is weird though sometimes I feel like an interloper in the neighborhood. When you go to some of these things [events] where Sandra [a long-term resident] stands up and says, “I’m a 28th generation African American Washingtonian,” …you know, like I feel measly, 3rd generation! And frankly I bought my house because it was all I could afford. I would
have gone more towards Dupont if I could have afforded it. But it’s been a godsend in terms of change… When I moved back I was gay and times were so different that you wanted to live close to a gay community because there was a lot of direct and indirect discrimination, socially and work wise. So it was like so critical for me to move into the city and the city was crazy then, but I moved in that neighborhood.

Many young urban professionals also thought the neighborhood was perfectly located for them to afford housing while also having easy access to their work downtown or in the federal enclave. Brianne Nadeau moved to the neighborhood ten years ago after graduating college. Interested in local politics, Brianne (Nadeau, 2012) began to get involved with the community:

**Brianne:** At the end of 2003 I moved to U Street. Now, at the time all my friends lived in Dupont Circle and I could not afford it so I found this place, this great little apartment at New Hampshire and where that crazy intersection of New Hampshire and 15th and W and Florida. Right below the park. Um, anyway so I moved there in 2003 and I stayed there for like 5 ½ years until I could buy a place and now I live at 14th and Belmont and I love it.

It was sometime when I was in grad school at AU [American University] that I was like, it was after my 25th birthday so it was 2005, I was like, “I gotta register here, I got to get involved.” So I registered to vote when I got my new driver’s license and then joined the Neighborhood Association. It was Meridian Hill, is still, Meridian Hill Neighborhood Association and the first thing I did was offer to coordinate a block for the neighborhood clean-up. And that was sort of when I first came out on people’s radar really because they were like who is this girl that is organizing a block.

Both Brian and Brianne would eventually become key community leaders. Their involvement was one path taken by second-wave gentrifiers. Other second-wave gentrifiers were more apathetic. Some young urban professionals were motivated to move to the neighborhood for similar reasons as Brian and Brianne, but did not become engaged in community politics due to various reasons such as demanding work schedules or general lack of interest (McCall, 2010).

In the early 2000s U Street/Shaw retained its status as a music destination despite the crime that remained in the area. Alternative and Indie Rock bands played The Black Cat on 14th Street, NW owned by Foo Fighters frontman, Dave Grohl, as well as the 9:30 Club, U Street Music Hall and other venues. Overtime, a sizeable contingent of musically-oriented young
professionals moved to be near these venues. Vera moved to the neighborhood in 2004 as part of the second-wave of gentrification. For the most part she found discussions over changes in the neighborhood generated little action out of her core group. Vera described how second-wave gentrifiers viewed their impacts on the neighborhood’s culture in the face of redevelopment:

**Allison:** Can you tell me a little bit about how that crowd viewed the U Street/Shaw area and the history that was associated with it and what was being associated with it?

**Vera:** Well, I considered the indie kids to be more culturally-aware newbies; they wanted to be culturally aware at least. There was a mix of pro- and anti-gentrification. Tim [Vera’s ex-boyfriend] thought that gentrification was good because it was bringing the culture of the area to the surface. Gentrification to him was a means to help culture. And there were a lot of people that thought that way. Of course, they didn’t see the evils of people [long-time residents] being pushed into Prince George’s County and out of the area. In general though, it got hard-headed between people pro-gentrification, against it, and those in-between. It was a point of discussion for a lot of us and it would get quite involved. Then, there were a lot of business majors in the area too...they liked living in DC and the affordable housing associated with the neighborhood but they didn’t give a shit about the neighborhood. Whereas the indie population was fucking aware of it and it was a topic of discussion. But, nobody was involved in the neighborhood that way that I knew. It was just a bunch of yappers talking about things. Lots of people were involved with non-profits like Democracy Now, MoveOn.org, but I think the main thing about that is the type of people that live in DC. There was little to no investment in making the area more valuable if you know what I mean (McCall, 2010).

Vera’s experience is subjective and there may have been members of the musically-minded social scene that were involved in the community at that time. However, Vera’s group of friends displayed a distinct difference from Brian and Brianne. Vera’s social group of second-wavers consisted primarily of renters and did not intend on investing in the neighborhood in the purchase of a home. In comparison, Brian and Brianne each purchased a home and thus had a greater stake in the neighborhood’s development and service provision. In this way, many second-wave homeowners worked together to improve their homes and their neighborhoods through sweat equity (Card, 2012).
Third-wave gentrifiers: mid-2000s to present.

Third-wave gentrifiers moved into the area once U Street/Shaw had been identified as a hip place to live and was marketed as a new center city urban destination. Many residents of this wave moved to the area due solely because of its location and amenities. The majority of third-wavers are young urban professionals with advanced degrees as exhibited by the neighborhood’s changing demographics outlined above (See Appendix B for demographic information). While these residents have an interest in their community, they often work too many hours to be able to fully enjoy all the facets of the neighborhood including knowing and interacting with their neighbors. One resident in a mixed-use condo development explained:

**Carla:** My husband and I, we just aren’t home that often. We work long hours. We wish we could go and enjoy the entertainment venues and the history [of the neighborhood], but we never have time. Really, we just frequent the restaurants (Kim, 2012).

Third-wavers represent Florida’s (2002) creative class of young urban professionals with high salaries and expendable income that can be spent in the neighborhood. While they do spend their money in the community, they often do not have the time to socialize with their neighbors or serve on local community boards. Brian described the changes he saw in the neighborhood’s social atmosphere when as the gentrification gained momentum in the mid-2000s:

**Brian:** Now I have next door neighbors now. Two lawyers, very nice, but it’s kind of funny…they can’t even garden their front yard, they pay a gardener to do their postcard front yard and not even do it well. Very nice people, but there was a camaraderie where you would actually help each other work on your house. What seems really weird though…if there is a dead rat in front of your house, you need to put it in a bag. If there is snow in front of your house, you have to shovel it…some of these people seem to be oblivious to anything.

The changing demographics of the neighborhood indicate that U Street/Shaw has witnessed multiracial gentrification as a variety of higher-income earning residents move into the neighborhood from various racial and ethnic groups including whites, blacks, and Hispanics.
The diversity of U Street/Shaw’s gentrification was described by Brianne as a form of change:

**Brianne:** …I actually never use it [the term gentrification]…I call it our changing and growing neighborhood. But you know, that is kind of wimpy…I haven’t message-tested that….it’s so politically charged…not to mention racially-charged…but you know gentrifiers look all kinds of different ways….Like my neighbor downstairs, she goes, “I’m a gentrifier and I am black!”…so…and that’s the thing and we’ve got this growing Latino population.

Understanding the various waves of resident settlement in U Street/Shaw during the gentrification process and their associated neighborhood cultures/lifestyles illustrates the complexities inherent in governing and placemaking among a diverse community of long-term and newer residents (Woldoff, 2011).

**The Changing of the Guard: U Street/Shaw Neighborhood Politics.**

The influx of new residents has drastically changed the look and feel of U Street/Shaw neighborhood politics. Since the first-wave of gentrifiers in the 1990s, first and second-wave residents have begun to establish themselves in leadership positions. In some cases, long-term residents have drawn away from neighborhood politics transferring power to newer residents.

The government structure of the U Street/Shaw community outlined above referenced ANC1B as a vital resource for brokering Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) with developers. At one time, however, the ANC was run inefficiently by a well-known long-time Washingtonian resident and former wife to Marion Barry, Mary Treadwell. Brianne described her knowledge of the transformation of the ANC from long-term to new resident ownership while we walked down 14th Street:

**Brianne:** I had already been doing all this stuff in the community and then the sitting commissioner decided he wasn’t going to run again so I was well positioned to put my name out there and I ended up running! But, yeah, so that was 2006 and then I was elected and obligated to serve. But that was when I first met some of my greatest mentors that had been around a lot longer and had seen a lot more on U Street. Mary Treadwell was the chair of the U Street ANC and during that time she embezzled, I want to say
hundreds of thousands, but it might have been tens of thousands of dollars and because of that the ANC’s assets were frozen for a long time. Which meant when I got in there we had this huge surplus. Like probably a $90,000 surplus that we weren’t exactly sure what to do with and we could tell that the city was starting to eye that with some hunger. Right, so like every time we went before the council they’d be like, so what are you doing with your surplus? You know? Why is that money sitting in the bank?

Brianne’s answer to the City Council was to organize various sub-committees that could be chaired by current community members dealing with different issues ranging from design guidelines to development to trash removal. These committees worked on the various issues and reported back to the ANC on their projects. These projects then were vetted to be considered to be funded with ANC resources. In the end, the committees took some time to set up, but continue to be present today. Brianne recently furthered her commitment to DC politics by announcing her intention to run against Jim Graham in the 2014 race for Ward 1 City Council.

Neighborhood organizations such as the U Street Neighborhood Association were established and run by first-wavers who recently handed power over to second-waver, Brian Card. Brian openly discussed his concern over the direction of the neighborhood and how to engage long-time residents and diversify membership:

**Brian:** Our organization is going through some interesting changes and several of the core people are moving. Have moved or are moving. We have our elected officials, but we have a loose kind of executive group which we do a lot of stuff by email and it includes several of the [first-wave] past presidents, like Scott Pomeroy was a past president. So you get a lot of that. Brian [another Past-President] is moving to NE and Scott just put his house on the market. And rumor is will probably be moving to another neighborhood. So I feel a little uncharted. When the organization started there were very particular things they were focused on like obtaining historic designation for the neighborhood was a major victory and a lot of very specific business-resident type of initiatives and getting grants and pushing very hard. So I feel not having all the history of all that, sometimes I’m not quite sure…I know process wise how to do it, but sometimes I don’t feel I have the clear vision some of my predecessors had.

We recently had Blair Ruble came and talked for our neighborhood association [including long-term residents]. I’m listening to them [long-termers who came] and I’m wondering what they are doing there since they don’t seem to identify with our group. We recently got an African American chair and I was like yay! I’m not used to being in
all white places it kind of makes me nervous. I have not seen that engagement, I am not sure if that did exist…I know there was a time where there was a lot of overlap between our organization and the Mid-City Business Association, but that is now dormant (Card, 2012).

U Street/Shaw’s neighborhood politics have changed greatly since Walter Fauntroy successfully saved the neighborhood from urban renewal (Ruble, 2010). The changing demographics have caused a power shift in the political climate of the neighborhood where first and second-wave gentrifiers are now brokering CBAs and working with developers to retain affordable housing. In 2005, the adoption of The DUKE Plan during the third-wave of gentrification provided a formal path for redevelopment for the community. The implementation of the plan has led to increased economic vitality while celebrating the “Black Broadway” period and African American music and live entertainment. The chapters that follow illustrate the impact of culturally-framed redevelopment on the three scales—neighborhood, anchors, and individual—highlighted in The DUKE Plan.
CHAPTER 4
BRANDING AND RE-BRANDING HISTORY: THE PRODUCTION OF AUTHENTIC PLACE BRANDS

Redevelopment changes the face of communities through physical improvements, economic investments, and spurring an influx of new residents. Development and redevelopment constructs and inherently redefine the cultural, political, and social boundaries of neighborhoods (Harvey, 1989; Mitchell, 2002). *The DUKE Plan* intentionally drew upon U Street/Shaw’s African American heritage as a means to frame and market redevelopment that would change the neighborhood’s boundaries. Serving as a tool for growth, the neighborhood’s historical narrative could be used to create a consumable space while also involving long-term residents in the planning process as a form of equity.

This chapter examines the dynamics of heritage and arts-based place branding at the neighborhood scale to reveal how brand development, management, and performance can simultaneously engender unity and conflict within neighborhoods. The boundaries of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood employed in this study were historically referred to as Mid-City or Uptown. Redevelopment plans established the naming of the neighborhood as Shaw in the 1950s (Ruble, 2010). Culturally-framed redevelopment within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood supported the delineation of the community into three distinct neighborhoods: U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle.

Heritage trail and arts district branding at the neighborhood scale is a socially constructed process. Planners and stakeholders continually engage and interact with one another has and continues to have a direct impact on neighborhood identity formation and visions for future growth. To date, the intentional identification and marketing of U Street/Shaw as a historic entertainment corridor has contributed to neighborhood’s transformation from being distressed during the 1970s and 1980s to the development of three distinct, thriving cultural destinations.
and residential communities: U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle. However, a recent effort to include these neighborhood brands under the “umbrella brand” (Felix, 2010) for an arts district overlay resulted in both neighborhood and political conflicts in regards to consistent marketing of neighborhoods and brand loyalty.

In order to understand the business of branding neighborhoods in Washington, DC an examination of the relationship between arts and heritage investments and place branding in modern planning practice is discussed, particularly within historically African American communities. My contribution to this literature outlines how various types of cultural and heritage investments are layered to form and contribute to developing a place brand that is then marketed to both local and outside audiences. An examination of heritage trail development by the non-profit Cultural Tourism DC in U Street, Logan Circle, and Shaw examines the creation and maintenance of neighborhood brands that produce unique consumable landscapes for residents and tourists. In comparison, an analysis of the arts overlay branding process demonstrates the complications associated with creating multiple scales of brands in an area with already established place brands. The possible effects of place branding on neighborhood change and authenticity are outlined along with recommendations for communities seeking to develop their own place brands. The outcomes from heritage trail branding support the contention that the production of authenticity is a negotiation of preservation as a form of equity and commodification as a pro-growth strategy in culturally-framed redevelopment.

**Developing a Marketable Neighborhood Identity: The Relationship between Arts and Cultural Heritage Assets and Place Branding**

Arts and cultural heritage investments are strategically used to market the perceived positive aspects of the inner-city that are most appealing to outsiders that value cultural consumption and difference—the creative class (Bell and Jayne, 2004; Roodhouse, 2010; Florida, 2002).
Numerous scholars have described the intentional marketing or branding of African American history with an emphasis on historical entertainers, artists, and writers in order to attract higher-income individuals and families to live in and visit inner-city neighborhoods (Pattillo, 2007; Hyra, 2008; Grams, 2010; Zukin, 2010; Ruble, 2010; Jackson, 2003; Gotham, 2007). Historic structures and particular narratives are teased out and edited through preservation and tourism efforts to renew a neighborhood’s reputation and positively display a neighborhood to outsiders (Sturken, 2007; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Fine & Speer, 1985; Kaufman, 1998; Jackson et al., 2006; Smith, 2008). Place branding repeats the newly adopted identity of the neighborhood through local and tourist media outlets as a means to capture creative class residents, tourists, and spending patterns. These initiatives which leverage cultural and heritage assets have not replaced past revitalization planning programs such as empowerment zones, tax increment financing, and workforce development. Rather, culture and heritage provide a new framing device through which all other programs become united in restoring a disinvested neighborhood to its historical or cultural “heyday” (Ruble, 2010; Hoffman, 2003).

This section outlines how arts and heritage investments and place branding are currently used in tandem by cities to transform historically minority-majority urban neighborhoods. Typically, cultural and heritage assets are first defined, supported, and revitalized; followed by the identification and marketing of a place brand based on those assets. However, there are cases in which place branding and cultural and heritage investments occur in tandem as well as cases in which branding efforts serve as a precursor to the development of cultural and heritage assets. In the case of U Street/Shaw, cultural and heritage investments occurred prior to as well as in tandem with heritage trail branding efforts while the promotion of an arts overlay brand attempted to serve as a precursor to the development of a more cohesive arts district.
Defining Cultural and Heritage Investments and Types

Cultural and heritage investments include the strategic economic, public, and/or political support of a range of place-based activities that emphasize the production and consumption of the agreed-upon unique qualities and identity that exists within a particular spatial context such as a neighborhood, district, city, or region. Investments can be purely economic in the form of direct investment and flows of capital from public and private investors to create entertainment clusters that combine dining, arts, cultural, and heritage events (Clark, 2011, 2002; Lloyd, 2004; Zukin, 2010, 1999, 1986). Public investments may be the result of grassroots advocacy for the recognition and preservation of an area’s identity as perceived by a particular group that claims residence, history, or connection with a certain place or site. This act is called a claim of authenticity (Kaufman, 1998; Zukin, 1999; Brown-Saracino, 2009). Finally, political support of cultural and heritage investments include a combination of the economic and public support investments described above. Political officials and entities may allocate funds and promote specific land-use strategies to capitalize on the distinctive attributes of an area as a method to encourage redevelopment, private investment and entrepreneurship (Hoffman, et al., 2003). At the same time, politicians may provide funding mechanisms to community-based groups and similar agencies to contribute to the preservation of a community’s character and identity as defined by the city, investors, and/or residents (Lin, 2011; Smith, 2008).

I define three forms of cultural and heritage investments: piecemeal, clusters, or districts (also referred to as quarters). Piecemeal investments focus on a few landmarks within a community that are identified as critical to the area’s history or identity. Heritage-related efforts,

---

8 Many gradations between these three categories of investments exist within cultural and heritage investments. The types of investments outlined above should be considered as examples of the three categories of investments (economic, political, and public) rather than a finite list types of cultural and heritage investments.
which will be further discussed below, such as National Historic Landmark designation, local walking tours, or support of a neighborhood museum are examples of this small-scale form of investment. Piecemeal investments are performed by a neighborhood organization or a few active residents that access available city, state, or nationally available funds or fundraise by appealing to the larger neighborhood or private enterprises. Efforts may also include developing neighborhood amenities that take into account the area’s cultural and heritage assets through the expansion of restaurants, open space, and retail outlets (Clark, 2011; Carr & Servon, 2009).

Cultural and heritage investment clusters are a set of intentional investments by a city, private entities, and/or local groups to support an existing creative industry or enact incentives for a creative industry to locate in a particular area within the city. Creative industries are those sectors such as art, theatre, and heritage that express a specific arrangement of meanings and values engendering a shared identity and memory (Roodhouse, 2010). Creative industry clusters are interconnected firms or individuals in related industries that compete, but also work with one another (Porter, 2000). For example, Zukin (1986) and Lloyd (2009) describe the construction of an artist creative industry cluster in previously distressed areas of New York City and Chicago, respectively. The development of these clusters occurred as a result of the cheap rents that initially attracted artists to live and work within these neighborhoods. As artists moved to the area so did makeshift galleries and venues for purchasing art products. Concurrent to the establishment of an arts industry cluster changing preferences for cultural consumption—meaning an increased valuation of diversity, arts, and amenities by members of the service industry sector—drew new middle-class residents to the arts industry cluster neighborhoods. The result is a seemingly natural evolution from a low-rent neighborhood that has experienced a degree of disinvestment to a vibrant community economy driven by cultural production and
consumption. In practice, cities often provide tax incentives and increased arts-related grant opportunities for artists to move to particular locations as well as rezoning and other land-use strategies to create a mixed-use neighborhood to attract upper-class residents (Zukin, 1986). Clusters are not limited to arts creative industries, but can include other creative industries and heritage efforts.⁹

Districting is the most comprehensive and formal type of cultural and heritage investment. Cultural and heritage districting involves defining, designing, and the eventual branding of a geographic area for the purposes of creating a space for a specific type of cultural and heritage production and consumption centered on a particular identity (e.g. artist collectives, ethnic enclaves). Public officials and private investors tend to lead the districting process while also involving existing residents in portions of the planning process (Roodhouse, 2010). Cultural district legislation has been passed by several states including Louisiana, Virginia, and Iowa among others as a means to develop particular spaces in order to compete with other urban areas (Bell and Jayne, 2004; LCD, 2011).

An established example of districting is the historic district which is regulated at the local, state, and/or federal level depending on the area’s level of designation (Stipe, 2003). Outside of historic districts, however, there are few local, state, and federal guidelines for the creation and maintenance of cultural and heritage districts within the United States leaving issues of authenticity, equity, and growth to be handled by city officials and those they decide to include at the stakeholder table. Previous studies completed by Hoffman (2003) and Zukin (2010) on ethnic neighborhoods in New York City, by Gotham (2007) in New Orleans’ historic French Quarter, and by Lloyd (2009) and Grams (2010) on creative industry clusters in Chicago.

---

⁹ Additional examples of clusters are ethnic enclaves, high-tech design shops, and folk crafts.
depict how cultural and heritage investments motivated by private and city-level concerns with economic growth lead to gentrification and displacement of existing residents. Commonalities between the types and scales of cultural and heritage investments reveal characteristics of the current socio-spatial order. In particular, a socio-spatial order that supports the interrelationship between tourism and redevelopment, an emphasis on consumable landscapes that can be easily recognized through place branding, and aesthetic appreciations of difference and diversity.

**Marketing Investments through Place Branding**

Place branding is the adaptation of corporate branding to places that often occurs during revitalization and draws upon unique attributes such as cultural and heritage assets to determine the marketable identity of a place. More specifically, place branding is an interactive process through which the identity of a place is constituted through a combination of the values and feelings of a place in relationship to an individual’s self-identity, group affiliation, and pre-existing knowledge (Moilanen & Rainsto, 2009, 17). Neighborhood branding, for example, involves a concentrated network of stakeholders that work together as smaller elements that contribute to a comprehensive place brand that is formulated through interactions within the district by residents and visitors. Numerous cities have hired outside contractors to develop city-wide place brands and destination place brands for districts (Moilanen & Rainsto, 2009). In some cases, place branding occurs within city government or through city grants to neighborhood groups.

According to Steve Callcott, the Deputy Director of Historic Preservation for the Washington, DC Planning Office, “Place branding has become a modern marketing technique for planning practices and an important component to rejuvenate [distressed] areas. It can’t be a top-down type of thing, though. It has to come from below and the city responds” (Callcott, 2011). The structure of place branding is fluid to include a wide variety of stakeholders within
the interactive process of place brand development. However, final approval and place branding management often occurs at the city or community organization level that initiated the effort.

Place branding is a collaborative effort between multiple stakeholders. The majority of place branding literature addresses the importance of stakeholder engagement in urban branding processes (Kavaratzis, 2005). Brands require continuous management and agreement by the diverse array of stakeholders in the community (e.g. the city, tourist developers, residents, historic preservationist; Ashworth, 2009). Together, these stakeholders must agree upon (either tacitly or actively) the place brand and reinforce the place brand through everyday practices in order for the place brand to be considered successful. Place brand networks comprised of area businesses, residents, and institutions serve as vehicles building the relationship between a neighborhood’s brand and the consumer through experiences and interactions (Hankinson, 2004). Therefore, place branding maintenance occurs on two scales: at the city- or organizational-level\(^\text{10}\) and at the community level. Once a place brand is adopted the city or organization regulates the continual communication of that brand through advertising and marketing strategies. The place brand is also regulated through the social practices and relationships that occur within the community.

Organizational- and community-level branding creation and maintenance is centered upon developing a core brand to communicate to an audience. Core brands are a form of place branding that is a conscious effort to change the way user groups (e.g. residents and visitors) perceive a place (Ashworth, 2009; Kavaratzis, 2005). A core brand creates a recognizable place identity that can be used in an effort to further other desired projects or outcomes included, but not limited to, increased tourism, financial investment, and social or political capital (Kavaratzis, 2005).

\(^{10}\) Depending on which stakeholder spearheaded the branding process. As previously discussed typically the city or a community organization spearheads such a process.
For instance, Chinatowns have become a core brand that draws visitors to Chinese cultural districts in New York City, San Francisco, and other large cities (Lin, 2011). Once the core brand is established, place branding practices extend the core brand through relationships with stakeholders groups including infrastructure (e.g. access services, hygiene facilities), media (e.g. public relations, newspapers, television), primary service providers (e.g. retailers, events and leisure activities, hotels), and consumers (e.g. residents, employees, tourists) (Hankinson, 2004, 115).

Core brands that draw upon cultural and heritage assets relate to one of the following categories: place of origin branding, culture/entertainment branding, or destination branding. Place of origin branding focuses on highlighting a place as the birthplace as a well-known person, site of a historic event, or home to a particular product or new invention. Culture and entertainment branding involves the concurrent development of place management with the rise of economic development theories that emphasize the attraction of the creative class as a means to generate city wealth (Florida, 2002). The interventions within this trend value tourists as much as the local population. Similarly, destination branding, or the marketing of tourist destinations, represents the most developed form of place branding in practice and theory. For example, Ritchie and Ritchie (1998) suggest their research on the effects of destination brands reveal the potential for brands to exhibit spillover effects and to operate within an organizing role for “a broad range of community development efforts” (19).

There are three main core branding tools used in neighborhoods: personality association, signature buildings and design, and hallmarking. An example of personality association is the branding of U Street/Shaw in Washington, DC as Duke Ellington’s childhood home which is discussed below. The brand was adopted and managed in the hope that the attributes associated
with Duke Ellington would be transferred to visitor and resident associations with U Street (DCOP, 2005). Personality association can have both positive and negative effects on a place depending on the nature of the personality that is associated with the place. Signature buildings and design use a flagship building, signature urban design or designer, or signature districts to promote the uniqueness of a place. Finally, event hallmarking is the organization and sponsoring of events such as annual ethnic festivals in order to attain recognition and establish brand associations (Ashworth, 2009). Through these tools cultural and heritage assets become signifiers for a place’s core brand that is promulgated through media and neighborhood organization discourse as well as the daily interactions of residents and visitors who may or may not reinforce the brand identity (Wherry, 2011). Both cultural and heritage investments and place branding are identified by city and neighborhood stakeholders as legitimate means to redefine the identity of a neighborhood, particularly in areas that have undergone long periods of disinvestment within the inner-city.

**Heritage Trail Branding: Turning One Neighborhood into Three**

Historian Kathy Smith’s heritage work occurred in tandem with the implementation of culturally-framed redevelopment in U Street/Shaw to create heritage-based brand for each of the neighborhoods (e.g. U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle). The creation of heritage trails within U Street/Shaw and its organizing mechanism, Cultural Tourism DC, employed piecemeal and clustering cultural and heritage investments as a means to preserve neighborhood histories and transform neighborhoods as points of destination for visitors. These efforts combined with city- and neighborhood-level preservation efforts solidified the neighborhood heritage brands of U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle. The following section describes Cultural Tourism DC’s
inception and trailmaking process as well as the brands established and repeatedly performed in each neighborhood.

**Cultural Tourism DC: The Evolution of an Idea and a Model**

Cultural Tourism DC is a non-profit organization consisting of more than 250 performing and fine arts groups as well as historical organizations. This coalition is united behind the goal of “creating strategic and replicable approaches that link cultural assets to economic benefits for the city [Washington, DC] and its diverse neighborhoods” (Smith, 2008, 1). After attending the 1995 White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, Kathy Smith was intrigued by the idea of applying a cultural heritage tourism approach. Her primary goal in doing so was an effort to promote Washington, DC tourists to venture “Off-the-Mall”—meaning off of the National Mall. In 1996, Cultural Tourism DC began as a grassroots community effort built upon a coalition between the Humanities Council of Washington, DC and the Historical Society of Washington, DC (Smith, 2008).

The early endeavors of Cultural Tourism DC included completing small, piecemeal projects, networking with potential funders, and developing a strong argument that neighborhood cultural tourism provided an economic benefit to the city. Smith served as a historian for the nomination of the 12th Street YMCA in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1994, but decided to broaden the scale of her findings. During the mid- to late-1990s, Smith and fellow historian, Marya McQuirter, completed an oral history project that chronicled the memories of almost 100 U Street/Shaw former and existing residents. The oral histories were compiled into the report, *A Guide to the Historical Resources of Shaw*. In addition, partnerships with local artists and photographers culminated in the 1997 photo essay titled “Remembering U Street” depicting the area’s black history from the early 1900s to 1968. The majority of the essay was contributed by Robert H. McNeill, whose collection included
photographs taken during his tenure as a local newspaper photographer during the 1930’s and 40’s (McQuirter, 2010). The exhibit was mounted on a construction fence at the corner of 13th and U Streets near the U Street/Cardozo metro stop.

During the development of “Remembering U Street” Smith and other Cultural Tourism DC leaders worked to cultivate partnerships with the city’s Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, Destination DC (the city’s main tourism organization), and the National Park Service. These partnerships culminated in 1998 with the co-sponsoring of a day-long conference with the DC Office of Economic Development entitled, “Culture and Commerce” focusing on the “potential of cultural heritage tourism for Washington” (Smith, 2008, 3). The result of this conference was the subsequent publication of an exhaustive report, *Capital Assets*, which listed the city’s entire heritage resources. The publication of the report prompted then-Mayor Anthony Williams to enter into an agreement with Cultural Tourism DC for a small funding allocation of $150,000 per year for five years.

Despite these early successes, Cultural Tourism DC required additional funding and evidence to demonstrate that their initiatives would prove to be economically beneficial to Washington, DC neighborhoods. What the organization found was as they focused more projects on U Street/Shaw, they would continually grab the attention of city government which provided the organization with both political and financial capital. Smith (2008) notes, “This project [the culmination of all the organization’s work in U Street/Shaw], of all the work of Cultural Tourism DC, made the most direct link between cultural heritage tourism, historic preservation, and economic revitalization” (9). For example, one major project was the PBS documentary *Duke Ellington’s Washington* that told the story of U Street/Shaw’s “Black Broadway” period between
1920 and 1950. The documentary aired on over 300 stations nationwide in an effort to both educate viewers and draw tourists to the neighborhood.

The second major project, the development of the Greater U Street Heritage Trail, resulted in the first formal partnership between Cultural Tourism DC and the city government. In 2000, Cultural Tourism DC was awarded a multi-million dollar Federal Highway Authority (FHA) grant for the purposes of creating urban heritage trails in partnership with the city government (Harper, 2010). Linda Harper, long-time employee of Cultural Tourism DC and its Executive Director from 2007 to 2013, explained how the partnership was formed:

**Linda:** Around 2000, funds from the Federal Highway Administration became available for trail enhancement through T-21 monies. The original intent was for these trails to be rural, but DC applied for funds for urban trails. The funds would come in at a ratio of 80/20, where 80 percent of the funds would be from the FHA and the rest would come from the city. During this time, Cultural Tourism DC was changing its name and broadening beyond heritage to cultural attractions, museums and the like. We applied for and worked with the city on the grant and we were granted the money to create 17 new urban trails. The first two of these trails were the Downtown Trail the U Street Trail. The U Street trail got into the ground first. U Street is now the more typical model we use of working with longtime and new residents. We now have 10 [trails] in the ground and two new this year [2010]—Georgia Avenue and Tenley Town.

As Linda explains, Smith and McQuirter’s oral history research was “distilled” into the form of the Greater U Street Heritage Trail. In 2001, the trail was “put in the ground” featuring Duke Ellington as the trail’s logo (Harper, 2010). Kathy Smith eventually left Cultural Tourism DC and relocated out of the District, but her vision remains as the organization is responsible for over 12 completed heritage trails and various public events that celebrate neighborhood heritage throughout the city (Levey, 2010). For Cultural Tourism DC, the heritage trail not only cemented a long-term partnership with the city government and regular funding, but validated their argument for the economic benefits of cultural tourism.
Cultural Tourism DC uses a five step model for consulting and negotiating a coherent historical narrative. First, a community must contact Cultural Tourism DC with their interest in having a heritage trail. Second, the community forms a neighborhood working group that usually includes key community stakeholders and residents. The working group advertises meetings and gathers visual and historical evidence belonging to residents. Third, the community completes six formal meetings. Within these meetings representatives from Cultural Tourism DC ask community members, “What story do you want to tell to a visitor in your community; what pictures do you want to show them?” (Levey, 2010). As Linda (2010) commented:

**Linda:** There was a real sense of caution for us in emphasizing to residents that “You [residents] need to tell us your story. We’re here to fact check, research, and get photos to put on the street, but you need to tell us your story.” We are just there to soak it in, massage it around, and get it out.

Fourth, after different stories are told through the working group, Cultural Tourism DC and participants agree upon a narrative for use along the heritage trail. Fifth, Cultural Tourism DC staff continues to research the history of the narrative, edit prose, and complete the final design of the heritage trail. Both Jane and Linda noted that focus groups quickly dissolve at the conclusion of the project. The entire process takes roughly two-and-a-half years and between $275,000 to $500,000 (Christensen, 2012; Harper, 2010; Levey, 2010). When asked for a general description of the model, Jane (2010) replied, “Since we do projects from the bottom-up, it takes longer, and requires a lot of patience...It’s important that at the end, people have ownership of the project.” Both Jane and Linda emphasize Cultural Tourism DC’s process in terms of “building community pride,” “branding a community’s name,” “increasing understandings of their own neighborhood,” and “community building” (Levey, 2010; Harper, 2010).

At the same time, Cultural Tourism DC staff members acknowledge that heritage trails market neighborhoods to outsiders. Jane (2010) noted, “For us [Cultural Tourism DC], it’s not
about marketing a neighborhood in the commercial sense. We market a neighborhood’s history.” Staff members work with communities to dialogue what parts of their neighborhood history are most important to them in order to develop a narrative arc or story line for the trail as well as a tag-line and logo that can then be used for brochures and signs to provide a cohesive message regarding the community’s heritage. Starting with the Greater U Street Heritage Trail Cultural Tourism DC staff mixed oral history interviews, archival data, and branding tools such as personality association to create unique heritage trails within U Street/Shaw.

**Greater U Street Heritage Trail: A City within a City**

The planning and implementation process for the Greater U Street Heritage Trail occurred between 2000 and 2001. At that time, Cultural Tourism DC was still headed by Kathy Smith. After receiving the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) grant for heritage trails, Greater U Street was decided to be the first neighborhood heritage trail in the city. The planning process occurred over a series of local neighborhood meetings in which community members engaged in dialogue and storytelling with one another and Cultural Tourism DC staff. These dialogues were used to identify a narrative as well as points of interest that should be included along the trail (Levey, 2010). During the planning process, the neighborhood population consisted largely of low- to low-middle-income blacks (U.S. Census, 1990; 2000). However, the neighborhood was experiencing a socio-demographic shift as higher-income whites were beginning to move into the neighborhood due to the recent opening of the U Street metro stop in the early 1990s (Brenner, 1993). The outcome of the heritage trail planning process was viewed by most participants as a positive process and a significant addition to the neighborhood’s cultural assets in 2001 (McQuirter, 2010).

The product of the planning process was the identification of the “Black Broadway” period of U Street/Shaw’s history as the dominant narrative. The “Black Broadway” period
occurred between 1920 and 1950 when the U Street corridor served as the black entertainment district under segregation and attracted nationally well-known black jazz acts including U Street/Shaw native Duke Ellington, poet Langston Hughes, and civil rights activist Thurgood Marshall (Williams, 2003). The Greater U Street Heritage Trail was given the tag-line “A City within a City” to celebrate the vitality of the neighborhood during the period of segregation. Overall, the heritage trail was framed by the central aim to document African American heritage, placing less emphasis on the cultural and class mix that existed in the neighborhood until the early 1920s. The narrative of “A City within a City” described not only an African American story, but an uplifting African American story in Washington, DC—a city in which the negative effects of segregation, poor city management, and poverty were well known.

Further, by emphasizing the “Black Broadway” period U Street/Shaw could be directly compared to another well-known African American neighborhood, Harlem, as a means to increase interest in tourism. Marya (2010), noted, “Harlem and the Apollo Theater were ever present in our discussion of Greater U Street [during the trailmaking process]. [Duke] Ellington was used as an icon because of his connection to the Apollo and Harlem and also DC—to show DC was just as important.” The comments by staff members indicate that heritage trailmaking is a socially constructed process in which residents and Cultural Tourism DC staff openly discussed not only on major neighborhood historical events and people, but how the community should be known or branded to outsiders.

Duke Ellington serves as the brand for Greater U Street. The choice of Duke Ellington as the brand for Greater U Street originated from the heritage trail process. Marya (2010) contends it became obvious to choose Ellington as the area’s icon, but then found it difficult to identity
precisely why he was chosen out of all of the individuals associated with the “Black Broadway” period:

**Mayra:** At that time [during the mid-1990s], Kathy was a historian with a marketing focus [due to her position with Cultural Tourism DC]. Residents focused on Duke Ellington as well. It came from folks who were there too. Duke Ellington was also used because there was a lot of talk at the time to showcase the importance of U Street… Duke Ellington is a beloved figure nationally and internationally so he was a good choice at the time. Other people could have been tagged and other neighborhoods could claim Duke Ellington. That’s a good question about “why Duke Ellington?” I’d have to think about that some more. That older gentleman I referred to earlier, the collector, he had materials he saved and Duke Ellington was prominent so I think it also naturally came out of that evidence as well.

Marya’s comment suggests that as a marketed persona, Duke Ellington, served two purposes as the brand of Greater U Street. He was nationally known and well-liked; therefore, he was a historical figure tourists on the National Mall may have been interested in learning about. He also supported the adopted uplift story of U Street/Shaw as a “City within a City” that both the city and Cultural Tourism DC were attempting to promote.

![Figure 4-1. Greater U Street Heritage Trail Guide Cover featuring Duke Ellington and Trail Map. From: Smith, 2001, 1, 14.](image-url)
The Greater U Street Heritage Trail model is important for two reasons. First, it cemented the planning process used by Cultural Tourism DC to develop heritage trails and brands. Second, the branding of the Greater U Street heritage trail redefined how the neighborhood was viewed by visitors and residents alike. U Street/Shaw has been transformed since 2001 as indicated by the demographic information provided in Chapter 3, however, the transformation has occurred in line with the history of U Street/Shaw exhibited on heritage trail signs. The corridor contains retail, restaurant, music venues, and theaters that attract an active nightlife. Redevelopments use names such as The Ellington and Langston Lofts to identify new construction with the corridor’s icons. Former Director of Marketing, Pat Wheeler emphasized that Cultural Tourism DC is associated with the success of the U Street corridor’s culturally-framed redevelopment:

**Pat:** It’s hard to quantify it [CTDC’s economic impact on neighborhoods]. We don’t say that economic development isn’t a part of it, but we do know just sort of intuitively if you are promoting the neighborhood and people want to hear about the neighborhood, to find out more, and the more you talk about the neighborhood the more people want to come to the neighborhood. I know we have been a big part of U Street’s success because of all the attention we focused on the [Greater] U Street Trail with our signs and that type of thing.

In the winter of 2010, Cultural Tourism DC helped the U Street corridor realize one of the goals outlined in *The DUKE Plan* by opening the U Street Neighborhood Tourism Center (DCOP, 2005, 42). The visitor’s center is located above Ben’s Next Door, the higher-end version of Ben’s Chili Bowl opened by the Ali family in 2008 (Prince of Petworth, 2008). The center hosts a visual timeline of the neighborhood’s history, educational video, brochures, maps, and merchandise including Ben’s Chili Bowl T-shirts. The center has been considered a success by neighborhood stakeholders and Cultural Tourism DC as Pat describes below:

**Pat:** We have a [U Street] Visitor’s Center. That’s the one thing I need to promote more. The people at Ben’s are counting the people for us. And the first year they reported 20,000 [visitors] which is huge considering it’s a neighborhood visitor center. I say the number is so much higher. I have been up there...where a [tour] bus will pull up...but then they stop and look around and now there is a video. No matter what they came in
for, there is a huge number of people going to our visitor’s center. We did that one [the U Street Neighborhood Visitor’s Center] because we got a grant to do it and a lot of places have said they want one too, but it’s not cheap. People think we just throw up some racks. There is timeline, we had to do that, we have the pictures that you blow up. We tried to make it interesting. We did a video. I think it was $90,000.

Figure 4-2. Interior and Exterior of the U Street Neighborhood Visitor Center. From: Author.

The visitor’s center reinforced the notion in the minds of residents and tourists that U Street/Shaw was historically a self-contained, black entertainment corridor in the city. Thus, the planning and marketing of the Greater U Street Heritage Trail and “Black Broadway” narrative redefined the boundaries of the community. The result of the Greater U Street Heritage Trail left the areas adjacent to the U Street corridor vying to be the next in line to go through the heritage trail process as a means to preserve history and catalyze economic development.

**Shaw Heritage Trail: Mid-City at the Crossroads**

U Street is located within the Shaw neighborhood. However, the development of a heritage place brand for Greater U Street separated the largely residential neighborhood of Shaw from its major retail corridor in the eyes of new residents and tourists. Neighborhood activists such as Alex Padro, director of Shaw Main Streets, Inc. and a local Advisory Neighborhood
Commissioner (ANC), worked with Cultural Tourism DC to develop a heritage trail shortly after the Greater U Street heritage trail was installed. In May 2006 Shaw’s heritage trail entitled, “Shaw: Mid-City at the Crossroads” was opened to the public.

The narrative and brand adopted for Shaw attempted to provide a complementary story of Mid-City life to that which was depicted in the Greater U Street heritage trail. The trail, which runs north and south along the 7th Street, NW corridor describes Shaw as “a place between places,’ where races and classes bumped and mingled as they got a foothold on the city” (Levey et al., 2006). Stops along the heritage trail include sites of black, Jewish, and Anglo-American history including the historic YWCA building, Carter G. Woodson’s home, the original home of the Young Men’s Hebrew Association, St. Patrick’s Catholic Church, and historic O Street Market site where various classes and races would travel to for food purchases.

Due to the diverse nature of the Shaw Heritage Trail an icon or brand is not readily apparent. The reason for this may be two-fold. First, many of the well-known icons that could have been attributed to Shaw’s heritage trail had already been identified within the Greater U Street Heritage Trail. As such, the Shaw Heritage Trail depicts the work of a larger number of everyday heroes within the community such as ministers and priests who devoted their lives to serving the community. Second, the 7th Street and 9th, NW corridors where the trail is located has not experienced the same rapid development as the U Street corridor. For example, the O Street Market has been slated to be redeveloped for over 10 years and only recently has broken ground (Callcott, 2011). Many of the historic sites are in disrepair such as the home of Carter G. Woodson—the founder of the field of African American History who lived at 1538 9th Street, NW. The neglected state of the national historic site has been highlighted in local media outlets
as a disgrace to his legacy and of icon of shame rather than fame in the neighborhood (Prince of Petworth, 2010a).

Despite the absence of a core brand, the Shaw heritage trail does identify the neighborhood as historically diverse which perhaps purposefully reflects the neighborhood’s current identity. Shaw is a well-known historically black neighborhood that also hosts new white and Hispanic pioneers, and serves as the center of the city’s Little Ethiopia enclave that is comprised of a plethora of Ethiopian restaurants and businesses. Shaw Main Streets gives neighborhood tours biannually in addition to the tours offered by Cultural Tourism DC and other tourism agencies. Throughout these tours the diversity of the neighborhood becomes the bridging narrative that continues to draw new residents and visitors.
Logan Circle: “A Fitting Tribute” to Legends and Pioneers

The Logan Circle Heritage Trail is a work in progress that is planned to open in the summer of 2013. The Logan Circle Community Association (LCCA) contacted Cultural Tourism DC and led the majority of the planning process. Over 700 people participated in the community meetings to develop the heritage trail which includes stops across the entire quadrant of U Street/Shaw that comprises the neighborhood. The trail’s completion was delayed due to budget cuts in 2011 as the city faced a fiscal crisis that caused many programs to suffer cuts, particularly to non-essential budget items such as heritage development efforts (NBC News, 2011). In the beginning of 2011 the major funding mechanism for Cultural Tourism DC provided by DDOT was cut from the city’s budget. Undeterred, LCCA and its Vice-President, Tim Christensen remained committed to making the Logan Circle Heritage Trail a reality. Sitting in the Cosmopolitan Café on P Street, NW one September afternoon that year, Tim Christensen displayed a positive attitude regarding the task ahead of him, “I have a lot of money to raise, but I think I can do it!” Not only was Tim committed to raising the remaining funds to install the
trail, but he spearheaded the trailmaking process as well as led trial runs of the heritage trail walking tour (Christensen, 2011). Fortunately, Tim did not have to wait long for his fiscal issues to be answered. In the late fall of 2011, DDOT released a Request for Proposals (RFP) that resulted in the funding of the Logan Circle, LeDroit Park, Bloomingdale, and H Street, NE heritage trails. The funding covered the fabrication and installation of the trail (Christensen, 2012). Tim’s diligence epitomizes the brand that will soon be apparent throughout the neighborhood’s heritage trail—the ingenuity of a small group of citizens concerned with improving their neighborhood.

The narrative and brand of the Logan Circle heritage trail center on the historic icons of the neighborhood such as General Logan himself as well as the active residents that moved to the neighborhood in its nadir during the 1970s and 80s and have worked consistently since to improve the area’s residential and commercial life. For example, on a bright sunny day Tim (2011) led a tour group of roughly 25 people to a quiet section of Logan Circle and describes the area’s former main attraction.

**Tim:** Logan Circle during the 1970s and 80s was rampant with prostitution. The first generation of the Logan Circle Community Association decided to do something about it. They purchased stickers—those stickers that you can’t get off of your car—and would walk around at night with flashlights and put them on johns’ cars. They said, “I had sex with a prostitute in Logan Circle.” Over the next few years those residents were instrumental in pushing the prostitution business out of Logan Circle and further downtown.

Throughout the tour Tim pointed out various residents who are long-running members of the LCCA and invited all of the tourists to come back for the 34th Annual Logan Circle House Tour put on by the organization in December. While also describing the long-time African American residents who once and still live in the neighborhood he also highlights the white pioneers that took the initiative to conduct reports to attract Whole Foods to locate to Logan Circle in the early
2000s. If Shaw’s brand is diversity, Logan Circle’s is one of change. More importantly, a particular change in which largely white pioneers of the neighborhood took the initiative to change the negative aspects of Logan Circle and create a more desirable neighborhood that attracted additional new residents of various races.

The Logan Circle Heritage Trail also distinguishes itself from the Greater U Street and Shaw heritage trails in the efforts by the LCCA, namely Tim, to engage long-term residents in the planning process. Multi-generational Logan Circle homeowners are still present in the Logan Circle community, but it was difficult for the LCCA and Cultural Tourism DC to get these residents to attend a heritage trail meeting. Understanding the valuable stories and information this group of residents could contribute, Tim worked with Jackie and Charles Reed—a white couple that moved to the neighborhood in the 1970s—to host a dinner party where long-term residents could gather and tell their stories. The event was pleasurable and fruitful. The residents socialized with one another while describing the neighborhood they used to know. For instance, Therrell Smith lives at 14 Logan Circle in one of the neighborhood’s grand Victorian homes. At 93, Smith remains active in the community as a dance instructor (Sheir, 2011). Her breadth of
knowledge of the neighborhood in relation to the black entertainment industry was invaluable to chronicling the history of the neighborhood (Christensen, 2012).

Christensen also hopes to leverage the momentum of the heritage trail planning process to create an educational outreach component for the neighborhood school—Garrison Elementary. Tim thought, “We have the opportunity to engage the kids, firsthand, in history, in their backyards—or the backyard of the school at least!” In 2012, he was pursuing the creation of instructional materials that could be appropriate for such an endeavor as well as working with the school’s administration to make his vision a reality (Christensen, 2012). Thus, Tim’s efforts may further the potential equity outcomes associated with culturally-framed redevelopment and place branding.

The Impact of Heritage-Based Neighborhood Brands on U Street/Shaw

Together, the heritage trails of Greater U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle depict the identity of an iconic African American area that remains diverse (for now) and has changed significantly throughout its history. Simultaneously, each neighborhood has drawn upon this comprehensive identity to carve out a particular niche or brand for the betterment of their particular needs as a community. The Greater U Street narrative draws upon the history of black entertainment to market the revitalized and vibrant corridor. Shaw’s trail depicts an appreciation for diversity that is needed amidst a neighborhood that has seen violent racial conflicts in the past during the 1968s riots and more recently when a young adult Ethiopian male was beaten to death after he threw a brick through the window of a local bar (Fischer and Grass, 2010). Finally, Logan Circle highlights its legends and icons of the past and present featuring historical figures and local residents who were instrumental in rejuvenating the neighborhood.

As a form of piecemeal and clustering heritage investments, heritage trails allow stakeholders to convey what they value about their neighborhood and its history. As a tool for
place branding U Street/Shaw’s three heritage trails intentionally identify unique characteristics in each neighborhood that can be marketed to the public for the purposes of generating increased interest (e.g. visual, economic) in each place (Ashworth, 2009; Kavaratzis, 2005). In U Street/Shaw, neighborhood place branding acts as a conscious effort to change the way historically low-income African American neighborhoods are perceived by higher-income earning socio-economic groups. Heritage tourism investments that feature the culture and heritage assets in African American communities support the re-branding and re-connoting of these neighborhoods as places safe for investment and consumption. Culturally-framed redevelopment in black neighborhoods that support tourism create safe tourist bubbles within the neighborhood for visitors to frequent including historic landmarks and urban entertainment amenities (Hoffman et al., 2003; Clark, 2011). The results of heritage tourism in U Street/Shaw have been highly successful as evidenced by the case studies of U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle. Therefore, it came as a surprise to local stakeholders when the notion of a larger area brand provoked a significant amount of controversy and demonstrated the inherent competition that place branding creates between neighborhoods.

**Mid-City Arts District Branding: Building an Umbrella for a Family of Brands**

In 2009, a group of concerned citizens from ANC 2F located in the Logan Circle neighborhood took the initiative to rejuvenate a defunct arts overlay district through a branding effort that would provide an “umbrella brand” of Mid-City for the neighborhoods of Shaw, U Street, and Logan Circle to develop and better support the area’s arts industry and creative economy. The branding process began with multiple public meetings where participants were encouraged to describe their opinions on what made Mid-City unique and what the arts meant to them (Felix, 2010). In a few short days, what had been a year-long planning process began to
unravel amidst resident and stakeholder conflict over branding as a key initiative to develop the arts district. Moreover, the neighborhood brands developed over time and influenced by heritage trails were feared to be lost in the shadow of an “umbrella” brand. The following section outlines the intricacies of the controversy surrounding the branding of the Mid-City Arts District through an exploration of the forces that developed the initiative, the structure and stakeholders involved in the planning process, and the difficulties associated with creating an overarching brand in an area with established neighborhood brands. The analysis of this branding effort demonstrates how connection to place brands and their repeated performance through space and time problematize notions of authenticity in neighborhoods undergoing significant social change.

**Arts District and Branding Initiative Background**

In the early 1990s Logan Circle residents and other stakeholders were able to successfully convince the city government to establish an arts zoning overlay for the Mid-City area entitled the Uptown Arts Overlay. The overlay was generally used to provide incentives for retail and restaurant development as well as arts spaces to generate activity along the corridors of the area that had become dormant and deteriorated (Christensen, 2011). In 2009, ANC 2F created an Arts Overlay Committee to review the zoning and economic initiatives that could be used to further enhance the arts district—a designation which had not been utilized to its full potential. The committee completed a report that stated various recommendations from tax policy reforms to alleviating parking issues. One recommendation was described as an immediate step that should be taken; adjusting the categories of the city’s Neighborhood Improvement Fund (NIF) grants to include aid to developing arts initiatives. The city responded and included arts as a category for the program originating out of the Office of the Deputy Mayor. The Arts Overlay Committee convinced four neighborhood organizations that had 501(c)(3) statuses to apply for the grant to amass the funds necessary for the project. Based on
NIF guidelines only $50,000 could be awarded to one organization. After being granted the maximum amount of funds the Mid-City Residents Association (MCRA), Cultural Tourism DC (CTDC), LCCA, and the Constance Whitaker Maffin Memorial Fund (CWMMF) entered into a memorandum of agreement to use the funds for a $200,000 branding project for the Mid-City Arts District. In return, the committee agreed to provide four deliverables: a community-wide dialogue to develop a brand, a finalized and consensus-based brand for the arts district, a strategic branding plan, and an event launch to mobilize and highlight local artists using the new arts district brand as a marketing strategy (DCAD, 2011a).

The project was headed by the leaders of the Arts Overlay Committee, namely, Carol Felix and Andrea Doughty. Carol Felix lived in the city and Logan Circle neighborhood for 30 years. She owned her own marketing consulting business and was married to a well-known real estate broker. Andrea Doughty worked for a financial consulting business and was a long-time resident. The committee had completed nine public meetings with 135 attendants involved in their initial work and felt that they would generally find support for their efforts (Doughty, 2010). At the first public meeting Andrea (Doughty, 2010) noted the historic nature of the branding project for the area and for the city.

Andrea: What are we all talking about tonight? The branding and marketing project is intended as a third step only to address the lack of a visible grant and treatment of the arts district. This initiative has been a historic first in DC. It is the first time that the city provided economic development funding to an arts district and it’s the first time that it’s funding a branding and marketing campaign in an arts district.

In a way, much was riding on the success of Andrea and Carol’s efforts including, but not limited to, the city’s opinion of branding as a tool for economic development. The results of their effort earned mixed reviews as did Carol and Andrea throughout the planning and implementation of the arts district branding effort.
Structuring the Dialogue: Willing Participants, Conflicting Voices

The Mid-City Arts District planning process included four steps. The first step was a series of public meetings to dialogue with community members about possible brands for the arts district as well as to launch an artist competition for street graphics which would represent the brand and the winning submissions of street lamp banners. The second step involved the announcement of a final brand for the arts district. The third step was the development of a Brand Strategic Plan. Finally, the fourth step involved the launch of arts district promotion in a public event. While the planning process seemed well-structured, the feedback at the public dialogues quickly changed the outcome of the branding effort.

Three public meetings were held at various spaces throughout the Mid-City area. One at a popular restaurant with a performance space located on 14th Street, Busboys and Poets, one in Shaw’s Warehouse Theatre, and a final meeting at Theatre J in Logan Circle (DCAD, 2010a). At the first meeting held at Busboys and Poets on August 31, 2010 Carol Felix (2010) described her branding approach to the large crowd that had gathered in the restaurant:

Carol: First of all, a successful brand must communicate a clear and cohesive message for all residents, businesses, stakeholders, investors, leaders within the broad boundaries of our district. Each and every stakeholder should feel a sense of pride, a sense of possibility, and more importantly, ownership within the culture of the overarching brand that we create here. This arts district is really a collection of mini-brands. Look at what we have here in the area of this large map. We have U Street, we have the 14th Street corridor, we have Logan Circle, we have parts of Dupont Circle, we have Little Ethiopia, and we have Shaw. These are all successful brands or mini-brands that help comprise a larger area.

If we are successful in creating this brand it will be something like an overarching, umbrella brand that will market the assets of all of the mini-brands that make up the diversity and uniqueness of this place. The mini-brands will continue to exist and thrive and in a perfect world they will be sustained through the strong marketability of the overall brand. This arts district is rich in history and future…we need to build our brand on the concept of these things and assets that we have. Legacy, pride, and style. This is our foundation, but we also want to market this arts district on a promise of what I’m calling fun. Fun starts in this area—an area where art and everyday living intersect to enhance economic development. So this is the big question.
What followed after an engaging panel with tourism and sociology scholars as well as neighborhood entrepreneurs was a general dissatisfaction with a branding campaign as a means to support an arts district. One resident recalled, “People just kept shouting. Alright, but what about the artists! Branding won’t help the artists! Why don’t you support the artists?” (Heck, 2010). According to the director of the artist collective, Mid-City Artists\textsuperscript{11}, Sondra Arkin (2011), “It [the branding effort] just became a debacle. I really don’t think the people who were doing it had any idea how much resistance there would be.” The members of the Arts Overlay Committee found themselves cast as villains in their attempts to promote an arts district due to their personal associations, neighborhood brand allegiance, and lack of trust in branding as a means to develop arts industries.

First, the legitimacy of the project was criticized through negative descriptions of Carol Felix and Andrea Doughty in the media as well-connected Washingtonians and savvy businesswomen attempting to take advantage of their leadership roles. Each woman had a strong record of community service, yet rumors circulated throughout the press, blogs, and other media outlets sharply criticizing them personally and their motives. Carol’s obvious connection to her husband—a local real estate broker—was slanted in the press as the main motivator behind the branding effort. Branding the area would create interest resulting in increased property values and more profits for her husband. Both Carol and Andrea’s previous community service came under fire. Message boards touted, “Word to the wise, if Andrea Doughty is involved, WATCH OUT” and “This was a jobs program for Doughty…and Felix” (DePillis, 2010b). The motives of Doughy and Felix are unknown, but commitment to a year-long community project that resulted

\textsuperscript{11} Mid-City Artists is not a 501(c)(3) so it was ineligible to apply for the NIF grant that was granted for the branding initiative. The group was, however, contacted early on in the process by the Arts Overlay Committee.
in a $200,000 grant for branding suggests that they were not villainous, but most likely concerned citizens who took on the task of an ANC initiative. Nevertheless, the portrayal of their motives in the press may have affected who participated and how throughout the entire planning process.

Second, participants at public meetings expressed concern that the neighborhood identities that had been built overtime in Mid-City would be overshadowed by the Mid-City Arts District brand. At the last public meeting at Theatre J one resident stated, “I’m not even sure I want to live in an arts district” (Heck, 2010). Residents had helped to build or been attracted to the character, identity, and brand that their neighborhood had inculcated over time and were wary of the effects of being a part of a larger arts district. Another resident stated, “I live here because it’s a neighborhood. I don’t want to live in a place like downtown or Chinatown” (Heck, 2010). Here, the resident is concerned that a large arts district initiative would change the residential character of his neighborhood to being more like the large-scale developments located in downtown Washington. These concerns over neighborhood allegiance and fear of large-scale development caused many residents to be critical of the project.

Third, stakeholders were not convinced that branding was the proper approach to encourage the development of the arts district and Mid-City’s creative economy. Sondra Arkin (2011) commented, “$200,000 seemed like a large amount to take for neighborhood development and put towards a rebranding effort. It seemed like too much and not enough at the same time. It was so much money that people freaked out about how it was spent, but not enough to [fully develop the arts district]. I’ll tell you what. The people who did it earned every penny.” The budget for the branding effort was publically distributed and exhibited on the arts district website in an attempt by the organization to maintain transparency. The majority of the funds
provided by the year-long grant went towards the project deliverables which totaled $153,460. The largest deliverable was the production and installation of street banners throughout the major corridors of the arts district costing $75,000 (DCAD, 2010b). Despite the full disclosure of the grant budget stakeholders continued to be critical of the project and its leaders. Some residents, particularly those within the arts community, would have liked a portion of the money go towards supporting local artists. Arkin (2011) stated Mid-City Artists was supportive of the project, but desired a larger arts-related programmatic focus.

What’s in a Name?: The Politics of Recognition

Controversy abounded the Mid-City branding effort, including the name of the project. At the initial public meeting Felix outlined the option of renaming the Mid-City Arts District.

Carol: What’s in a name? Well, as we know, we have a lot of historic areas today in the city. We have Mid-City. We have our very successful new Mid-City café is using the term Mid-City so there is a lot of success with that particular name. We have the Mid-City Residents Association, the Mid-City Business Association. These things matter. Uptown, another name the city designated this district as the Uptown Arts Overlay District. I was watching just recently a wonderful documentary that was Duke Ellington’s Washington: The Rise, Fall and Rebirth of a Neighborhood and it referred to the Greater U Street and Shaw area as Uptown repeatedly, again and again, Uptown. So there’s that history as well. Whatever name we land on, we need a name that sells this destination. This is what is at the heart of a marketing program. Businesses, developers, residents, and visitors need to feel comfortable saying this name.

With the name of the arts district open for negotiations sects began to form within the larger community. Mid-City Artists, Sondra Arkin included, were comfortable with the Mid-City designation. In comparison, few residents felt any connection to Uptown as a moniker for the district based on an on-line poll conducted by the branding leaders. It seemed as though Mid-City was a widely agreed upon name for the arts district until city politicians began to catch wind of the community-led branding effort.

After learning of the arts district branding initiative, Councilmember Jim Graham openly objected to the Mid-City title stating, “We have powerful designations already for this arts
district—Shaw, Logan, and most importantly for this purpose, U Street. Why invent—why manufacture—something new?” (in Harvey, 2010). Graham also gained support for his objection from Shaw Main Streets and Destination DC, the city’s tourism office. Graham was even rumored to have threatened pulling the funding from the branding effort if his objection was not taken seriously (Heck, 2010). In response, Doughty and Felix dropped the Mid-City title for the arts district and renamed the area the DC Arts District. Yet, the new title alienated key stakeholders such as Mid-City Artists, the Mid-City Residents Association, and the Mid-City Business Improvement District. In the wake of possibly losing their funding, or at the very least, being politically decimated, the branding leaders dropped the Mid-City name and literally manufactured a new identity for the arts district.

An As Yet Unfulfilled Promise

The final branding graphics were revealed at a public event on November 8, 2010 at Longview Gallery in Shaw. The logo includes a pointillist halftone style of the L’Enfant plan while including the DC Arts District (DCAD) logo and the “mini-brands” of Logan, Shaw, and U Street. The adjacent banner included various photographs indicative of the neighborhood such as artists working, musicians, and local icons such as Duke Ellington (Harvey, 2010). In keeping with the controversial nature of the project, the final branding scheme was not universally approved throughout the arts district area. Both the U Street Neighborhood Association and ANC1B that comprises portions of both U Street and Shaw did not endorse the brand schematics. Regardless, the banners were installed in December 2010 along various corridors throughout the arts district.
While the banners provide a new form of street decoration little else has been done to support or further develop the arts district. The branding leaders created an official website for the arts district (located at www.dcartsdistrict.org, now defunct), but no updates have been posted since March 2011. Reactions to the branding effort have been mixed by both supporters and critics of the project. Tim Christensen, who helped manage the financial oversight of the project felt ambivalent. He stated, “Well, it’s nice they are up there, but they are temporary. They are only supposed to last for a year or so. So I am glad to see them up, but they aren’t going to last long” (Christensen, 2011). Sondra Arkin (2011) shares a similar perspective asserting, “There are a lot of snarky comments around in regards to the banners. Like, “oh look we’re in the arts district now, but not much else, nothing positive.” Having a background in business and leading branding initiatives Sondra also feels there is a fatal flaw to the DC Arts District branding.
**Sondra:** Branding is a promise. You need to deliver on that promise. If it’s not successful it can actually have a negative impact on your creative economy. I don’t think it [the arts district branding] delivers on that promise.

Sondra’s comments are supported by the lack of evidence of continuing programming or additional funding initiatives since the conclusion of the branding project in December 2011. The result of the branding effort created more conflict than unity by creating sects within the community pitted against one another by allegiance to different scales of branding. As a result, the ability to deliver on a cohesive promise of an arts district remains unfulfilled.

**Neighborhood-Scale Discussion: You Can’t Build a Brand in a Day**

Culturally-framed redevelopment as employed in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood depicts place branding in relation to arts and heritage investments. Targeted investments require careful planning and support from community members and key government officials. Three key factors to creating meaningful arts and heritage-based place branding emerge from this case study: timing; community capital, and consistent engagement. First, timing is crucial to a place branding effort. Cultural Tourism DC developed neighborhood heritage brands as U Street, Shaw, and Logan Circle were in the process of redeveloping or had been redeveloped by a close-knit group of neighbors. These neighborhood dynamics provided an environment conducive to heritage branding in which long-term (and new) residents wanted to preserve the past as the economic future of the neighborhood grew brighter.

Second, leaders and participating organizers should be certain of their position within the community and ideally hold some form of community capital. Community capital can be defined as a well-developed respectability and résumé of positive community service. Cultural Tourism DC draws upon established local neighborhood leaders, like Tim Christensen, to help organize trailmaking. Within U Street/Shaw community capital is earned through dedication to *both* long-
term and new residents. For instance, Alex Padro (first-wave gentrifier) and Tim Christensen (second-wave gentrifier) are considered established community stakeholders due to their investment in the community and engagement with long-term residents. Padro, for example, has worked to secure affordable housing replacement in the wake of redevelopment as well as support tenant’s in their pursuit of right-to-purchase agreements when complexes consider conversion to market-rate housing (Poist, 2012). In comparison, while Andrea Doughty and Carol Felix each were dedicated community service workers, their personal connections, lack of interaction with long-term residents, and pro-growth intentions were scrutinized in the press.

Finally, place branding requires consistent engagement throughout and after the planning process. Cultural Tourism DC regularly corresponds with every participant who provides information on a sign-in sheet at meetings during and after the heritage trail. While the arts district branding effort did engage through website announcements and in public meetings they did not directly correspond with stakeholders in any other manner. The ability to develop and achieve a cohesive and fully supported place brand critically relies on appropriate timing, community capital, and continuous, inclusive stakeholder engagement.

The analysis of neighborhood and district branding in U Street/Shaw contributes to the existing body of literature on the dynamics between place branding and authenticity. As heritage trails were established in Shaw, U Street, and Logan Circle, they also became touchstones for each neighborhood’s identity and sense of authenticity that was repeated by residents describing their neighborhood to their friends and visitors. The arts district branding effort seemed to threaten those authentic brands that had been cultivated over time leading Councilman Jim Graham to openly object to the concept of an “umbrella” brand. Thus, brands can develop authenticity over time and unite neighborhoods undergoing change. Efforts to create an overall
district brand need to carefully engage the leaders that are involved with maintaining smaller scale brands to obtain support and possible strategies for managing a family of brands within a small geographic area. A family branding strategy would require a consortium of community leaders representing all brands to actively engage in branding creation and maintenance at all levels. While the arts district branding invited representatives from each neighborhood to participate in panels they were not given leadership roles in the branding process and easily became critical of the project. Finally, branding efforts should not be the only initiative taken on to develop a new program-based identity that involves arts or heritage. Both arts and heritage investments require additional programmatic support to deliver on the promise of a brand identity.

At the neighborhood scale, culturally-framed redevelopment produced two outcomes related to the balance of growth and equity. The heritage trail planning process divided the U Street/Shaw neighborhood into three entities that would shift how residents and visitors considered the neighborhood along cultural and political lines. By delineating these sections of the neighborhood, each community became unique with particular histories that could draw various sets of tourists and intrigued new residents. Second, the trail highlights the tensions that exist during the production of authenticity by drawing upon long-term resident knowledge and contributions to develop a marketable neighborhood identity. The agency of preservation was directly pitted against cultural consumption patterns. At a public meeting about Howard Theatre (See Chapter 5 for more on this landmark), an invited speaker and scholar of African American history and U Street/Shaw described the nostalgia that often accompanies neighborhood change:

**Speaker:** Ironically, what gentrification...[leads to is a]...new urgency to preserve and celebrate. And whenever you use the word “preserve” also use the word “celebrate.” You want to do both at the same time (Shaw Library, 2010).
Place branding both preserves and celebrates the history of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood and its associated mini-brands of: U Street, Shaw and Logan Circle, in a manner that complicates cultural preservation within the community and the relationship between long-term and new residents in addition to visitors and cultural landmarks.
The production of authenticity requires the validation of a place brand and identity throughout the physical environment and sites within a neighborhood. Social and economic anchors serve as place markers that support, uphold, and cement a place brand such as the cultural destination district outlined in *The DUKE Plan* for U Street/Shaw. The renovation and utilization of two theatres, as anchors for the redevelopment of U Street/Shaw within the “Black Broadway” narrative reveal how cultural landmarks serve as touchstones and a form of living history in place for residents and visitors. The Lincoln Theatre located at 1215 U Street, NW and the Howard Theatre located at 620 T Street, NW were each identified as key attractions for neighborhood residents and visitors as well as economic engines to promote ancillary entertainment-based ventures along the corridor. The story of the redevelopment of each theatre outlines how governance and the process of redevelopment dealt with pressures between commercial growth and community concerns regarding theatre ownership, mission and audience in a manner that produced a particular “authentic” U Street/Shaw African American identity.

The debates that will be described below surrounding each theatre’s renovation and management also portray the on-going issues of race and class within DC identity politics and heritage. Natalie Hopkinson, a DC-based journalist and author of *Go-Go Live: The Musical Life and Death of a Chocolate City*, described the segregated nature of DC nightlife despite the city’s recent demographic changes:

**Natalie Hopkinson:** Ten years ago I was working for *The Washington Post* and I wrote a piece on Culture Clash. I did a piece on the Republic Gardens [a U Street/Shaw theatre turned nightclub, now closed] which was there since the first iteration of “Black Broadway” in the 20s or 30s and has been continuously going on and off and reopened in 1995. At the time they were trying to get white people to come to Republic Gardens. But that is not really how it works in DC. Once a place has been branded black, it cannot be
changed. And that turned out to be true because white people didn’t come…they found when they did try to promote to non-blacks they had to promote a white night and a black night based on preferences [music, etc.] and it seems that it is easier for people to stay in their lane, you know, the path of least resistance…it’s still that way (Hopkinson, 2013).

Both the Howard and Lincoln Theatres opened in the early 1900s to serve the black population living in the city due to segregation. As each theatre underwent reconstruction the hands of those involved became a point of political contention along with the intended use, programming and audience that would be the primary users of each theatre upon re-opening.

This chapter outlines the role of two historic theatres as community anchor institutions in the revitalization of U Street/Shaw and the production of authenticity of the “Black Broadway” brand. In order to understand the anchor institutions, the role of economic and social anchors will be addressed. The examples of the Lincoln and Howard Theatres will bridge the gap within the existing literature between social, economic and cultural anchors as potential community economic development catalysts at the neighborhood scale (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010b, Clopton & Finch, 2011, Grodach, 2011, Bressan & Alonso, 2013, Taylor & Luter, 2013, Stern & Seifert, 2008). Second, the redevelopment of the theatres will be discussed drawing first upon the private-partnerships that were essential in rejuvenating the Howard Theatre into a potential economic anchor for the 7th Street, NW corridor. Then, the restoration and subsequent management struggles of the Lincoln Theatre will reveal the tension between government financial support, or lack thereof, and maintaining a community-owned institution. The discussion of this chapter outlines how each restoration project balanced growth and equity, and whether either theatre was able to realize its desired potential as an anchor for the neighborhood.

**Understanding the Role of Anchor Institutions**

The literature on anchor institutions is a fast-growing field that uncovers how cities, towns, and communities cultivate and maintain critical resources during periods of tight local
budgets and fiscal austerity. As many residents, primarily whites, migrated out to the suburbs during the mid-twentieth century, they took their capital with them leaving cities with a lower tax base from which to provide needed services and improvements. As inner cities increasingly competed with one another to retain private businesses and major commercial firms, decentralization, deregulation and privatization were considered a three-pronged strategy to answer the issue of limited resources and growing demands on city governments. During this time, anchor institutions became sites of stability and “change agents” for urban areas due to their size, place-based nature, and often non-profit status anchor institutions tend to stay in the communities in which they are located. (Taylor & Luter, 2013, 1). In addition, anchors typically engage in outreach efforts to improve the surrounding neighborhood. In the past fifteen years, anchor institution scholars have furthered the idea that “fixed assets” other than higher education entities could play a critical role in inner-city revitalization (Harkavy & Zuckerman, 1999 as in Taylor & Luter, 2013, 3). As such, anchor institutions have the potential to become the backbone of a neighborhood socially and economically (Cowell et al., 2012, Clopton & Finch, 2011, Markusen & Gadwa, 2010b). Research on anchor institutions is recent and subsequently separated between urban academic sub-fields. Within the literature three distinct forms of anchors are defined: economic, social and cultural. An analysis of the Howard and Lincoln theatres provides a practical and theoretical bridge between these disparate anchor definitions while also illuminating how authenticity is negotiated in terms of cultural landmarks.

Economic Anchors

The concept of economic anchor institutions was first formally introduced at a 2001 Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives (Taylor & Luter, 2013). Since then, a struggle has ensued to develop an agreed-upon definition for anchor institutions. In their literature review on anchor institutions, Taylor & Luter (2013) define anchors as “large,
spatially immobile, mostly non-profit organizations that play an integral role in the local economy” (8). Major attributes of anchor institutions have reached consensus relating to spatial immobility, corporate status, size, and social-purpose mission. Anchors are place-based, meaning they have either a large physical footprint in the community, are dedicated to serving a particular area as part of their mission, or feel a historical rootedness and tie to the neighborhood (Birch, 2007, Kordesh, 2002). For example, higher educational institutions such as Howard University in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood have traditionally been identified as economic anchors. Recent literature extends the definition of spatial immobility to city libraries, museums, and performance complexes such as theatres. Maurrasse (2007) contends that cultural institutions such as the Lincoln and Howard Theatres often become embedded in the cultural identity of a neighborhood (as in Taylor & Luter, 2013, 4).

Anchors are typically non-profit organizations and in some cases are the leading employers in their city, town, or neighborhood. Most important is the social purpose mission exhibited by economic anchors that include enhancing and promoting “democratic, mutually beneficial, and sustainable relationships with the host community,” that engender socioeconomic improvements and change (Taylor & Luter, 2013, 7). For Porter and Kramer (2011) the social responsibility of anchors has been reconsidered as a “shared value” where institutions pursue their interests in a manner that results in a positive impact on their host community. Combined, these attributes create the opportunity for an anchor to have a significant economic impact on the area in which it is located.

Anchors serve as key stakeholders and change agents during inner-city redevelopment processes (Hahn & Peaslee, 2003; ICIC, 2011). One reason anchors tend to invest in the surrounding community is that it often results in positive impacts on the institution itself.
Economically, anchors have both direct and indirect benefits for communities. Directly, anchor institutions often hold significant amounts of land that can add to the city’s tax base, employ area residents, and draw upon local resources for goods and services. Indirectly, anchors may draw in higher-skilled workers instigating workforce development programs as well as increase the consumption of goods and services by residents and nonresidents surrounding the anchor (Birch, 2007). Porter’s Initiative for a Competitive Inner-city (ICIC) suggests that local businesses can position themselves to benefit from anchor relationships by supplying goods and services, working with anchors to train and locate potential employees, and drawing upon consulting services (ICIC, 2011).

Economic anchors have been examined in the context of medical and higher education institutions. However, little research has been completed on how community anchor institutions are involved in the societal issues associated with revitalizing neighborhoods, towns and cities (Taylor & Luter, 2013, 11). The efforts to revive the Lincoln and the Howard Theatres directly addresses this gap in the literature while also examining how anchors are affected by issues of race and class as well as growth and equity.

**Social Anchors**

In a similar vein, social anchor theory (SAT), introduced in 2011, contends that communities inherently have a certain number of social institutions that anchor social networks creating neighborhood identity, associations and linkages (Clopton & Finch, 2011). Grounded in social capital theory, social anchors are defined by Clopton and Finch (2011) as “any institution that supports the development and maintenance of social capital and networks at the community level and provides an attachment for the collective identity of the community” (70). As social anchors, these institutions connect community members across demographic identities while also developing a unique place-based identity.
In SAT, social anchors are able to ground or serve as the headquarters for social capital development at the neighborhood level. Drawing from Putnam’s (2000) work on social capital, developing social networks between people who may not normally interact, referred to as social capital bridges, partnered with strengthening ties between residents already interacting with one another, known as bonding has a measurable impact on community capacity building. Social capital development holds the potential to bolster civic infrastructure, develop trust and reciprocity, and positively impact the economic health of a community. Ideally, social anchors enhance community identity and sense of place and create social network extensions across demographic boundaries by bridging capital (Clopton & Finch, 2011).

In addition, social anchors are able to bridge social capital through the creation and maintenance of a collective community identity. Tajfel (1978 as described in Clopton & Finch, 2011) discusses Social Identity Theory in which individuals create personal identities through the formation of ingroups and outgroups. Social anchors provide a means for residents to find and develop community identity. Strong communities often have potent collective identities due to a feeder system of subordinate identities that support the overall identity. For example, the renovation of the Lincoln and the Howard Theatres were subordinate identities that had the potential to support the larger place brand of U Street/Shaw as a revitalized “Black Broadway.” Social anchors, thus, allow communities to achieve authentic identity by preserving community attributes through “a consistent marker of identification” (Clopton & Finch, 2011, 74).

As centers for community identity and social networks, social anchors are critical in community development and redevelopment efforts. However, social anchoring can have some negative effects. Social anchors may become insular social networks that result in hyperbonding among community members that can negate community development and lead to social capital
fragmentation (Clopton & Finch, 2011; Abbott, 2008). Social anchors can range from community politics to physical spaces to cultural festivals (Bressan & Alonso, 2013). Typical social anchors include churches, cultural institutions and events, and non-profit organizations. There is little established in the literature on the study of social anchors and how they function within communities. Previous studies have investigated the social anchors of major sports team allegiances and the role of cultural institutes in the travel industry (Alonso & O'Shea, 2012; Bressan & Alonso, 2013).

**Cultural Anchors**

Cultural expression within communities has been converted into a catalyst for urban economic growth more so than a diversion from daily life. As previously discussed, cultural institutions, small and large, have been repeatedly leveraged as assets in cities as a means for redevelopment, rebranding and rejuvenation. Cultural anchors refer to any arts or cultural-based institution that serves as an umbrella organization, broker, or gathering space for the myriad of cultural activities that may occur within a community. According to Markusen and Gadwa (2010b), creative places anchor various enterprises and industries within the creative fields themselves or the ancillary sectors that provide them with goods and services.

Culturally-framed redevelopment has become a popular strategy for community development in the urban planning departments of many small-, mid- and large-cities (Clark, 2011; Lin, 2010, Wherry, 2011; Zukin, 2010). However, the growth of the creative economy exacerbates inequality and exclusion due to the process of gentrification associated with this type of investment. Stern and Seifert (2008) found that the creative economy does provide prosperity to the city, but also contributes to the “inequitable social and geographic distribution of its benefits” (1). Cultural anchors can counteract this undesirable outcome by mitigating displacement of smaller, long-term local businesses that provide services to the creative
economy that may also help maintain long-term residents. Cultural anchors may also monitor and safeguard the cultural clusters—social networks that are based in the productivity of cultural products—from displacement. As cultural anchors, institutions like the Lincoln and Howard Theatres, may have the ability to advocate for place-based, people-based neighborhood revitalization resulting in what Stern and Seifert (2010) call a “neighborhood-based creative economy” (6).

The literature on anchor institutions is divided among sub-disciplines such as economic development, community development, and cultural development. In practice, anchor institutions can breach the definitions outlined by each of these disciplines as cultural economic engines that also serve as nodes for social capital networks. The trials and successes of both the Howard and Lincoln Theatres bridge these distinct theoretical lines providing a much needed case study in the use of community cultural landmarks as anchor institutions in redevelopment. Moreover, the tale of each theatre provides a glimpse into the practical obstacles confronted during efforts to re-establish a community anchor institution.

**Theatres as Community Anchors**

The theatres in U Street/Shaw have repeatedly been identified as past, current and future community anchors (DCOP, 2005, Ruble 2010). On December 8th, 2010 the newly renovated Shaw Library on 7th Street, NW held an event discussing the history of the Howard Theatre which was then undergoing reconstruction. At the meeting a long-term resident described the importance of both the Lincoln and Howard Theatres to the social, economic, and cultural life of the neighborhood:

**Long-term Male Resident:** My father came here two years ago and he was reared here in DC, actually on Vermont Avenue, and he was just visiting and his eyes were just lit up as he came down the street—the whole corridor. And he shared with me that during that time, not only the Howard Theater, there was the Lincoln Theater, there was the Dunbar
Theater, I think he said another theater [Republic Gardens] during the Depression[that the family drew upon] to supplement their income…My grandmother would make lunches and dinners for the projectionists in all those theaters and he….he would attend a movie [or show]…[unclear]…he said it was great time he had so many memories of celebrities during little time frame [when he was working] on these little side jobs…On a regular basis these celebrities and these musicians were just strolling around. So my point is, it is very important to talk to the ancestors that you mentioned so you can pass them on down like my father did with me. I had no idea…I told my brother and we were like, “Why did you not to tell us this 20 years ago?” [He said] “You never asked” (Shaw Library, 2010).

The theatres in the neighborhood served multiple purposes such as bridging social networks between lower and higher-class people, serving as formal and informal economic anchors, and continually solidifying and communicating a particular cultural identity. Years later, city and community officials hoped the restoration of these theatres would rejuvenate the multifaceted roles the landmarks had once provided in U Street/Shaw.

It is important to note that there were many different institutions that served as community anchors in U Street/Shaw. None, perhaps, were more important than the churches in the neighborhood. The significance of African American churches to their parishioners and surrounding community during segregation, suburbanization, and today is well documented (Hyra, 2008; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990; Pattillo-McCoy, 1998). For example, the organization ONE DC, formerly a part of Manna CDC, Inc. was founded by New Community Church to help secure affordable housing for neighborhood residents as early as 1982 (Manna CDC, 2013). Other neighborhood churches such as Metropolitan Baptist Church and Shiloh Baptist Church, to name a few, were critical resources drawn upon by neighborhood residents for various forms of support (e.g. emotional, spiritual, economic, social) throughout the neighborhood’s history (Ruble, 2010; Hyra, n.d.). Since the early 2000s, though, these well-known community churches have deteriorated as social anchor institutions. Instead, as parishioners moved out of the neighborhood, church activities have frequently become a center of neighborhood debate and evidence of social fragmentation between long-term, new, and former residents. Many new
residents were/are non-religious or not interested in attending the historically-black neighborhood churches. Similarly, the church congregations began to move to suburban areas such as Prince George’s County, but continued to travel into the city on Sundays to attend church. The influx of cars in the neighborhood caused a rift between new residents and the churches as parishioners would double park on streets blocking in resident vehicles (Hopkinson, 2013). The debate became so toxic that Metropolitan Baptist Church, after a proposed project to construct a parking garage fell through, relocated to Largo, Maryland (Hyra, n.d.). Shiloh Baptist Church has also experienced a falling out with neighborhood residents due the large number of vacant and abandoned properties the church was bequeathed by parishioners and failed to rehabilitate causing large sections of blight along 9th Street, NW among others (Schwartzman, 2007, Walker, 2011). Over the past 20 years, the churches lost their status within the neighborhood leaving the theatres as one of the few remaining cultural landmarks that could serve as community anchors.

Saddled with an understanding of the scarcity of community anchors remaining in the neighborhood, the architects of The DUKE Plan chose to focus on the Lincoln and Howard Theatres as primary anchors in the revitalization of U Street/Shaw. Not only could the theatres serve as cultural heritage touchstones, but their ability to once again attract popular acts could increase the number of visitors to the corridor. The theatres could achieve a number of economic development outcomes by boosting tourism, serving as a venue for outreach and community events, incubating new talent, being a community center for artists, and work to build social networks and a collective identity (Grodach, 2011). The first goal of The DUKE Plan was “Filling the Gap” between the Lincoln and Howard Theatres to establish a “mixed-use destination-printed development program and strategy” (DCOP, 2005, 8). Much emphasis was
placed on the Howard Theatre which continued to lay vacant and infested with rats, while the
Lincoln had been restored in the early 1990s, but lacked patrons (ANC1B, 2010). The renovation
strategy for each theatre will be discussed by addressing the theatre’s history, focus in *The
DUKE Plan*, actions taken, and an analysis of the project’s ability to serve as a community
anchor and balance growth and equity concerns.

**Howard Theatre: A Deregulated Economic Success?**

On April 12, 2012 a large crowd gathered in front of the recently restored façade of the
Howard Theatre. After 30 years of dormancy and disrepair the theatre underwent a multi-million
dollar renovation that included commercial, non-profit, and government intervention. The theatre
shined with its new façade and metal sculpture entitled, “Jazz Man” of a musician playing the
trumpet. The theatre is located near the east end of the U Street corridor near the western
boundary of Howard University buildings, offices and landholdings. The neighborhood here has
maintained its identity and long-term residents more so than other areas of U Street/Shaw, but
continues to see significant changes in business ownership and resident demographics since the
city put its vision for the corridor into practice within the last eight years. The Howard Theatre
served as a form of architectural and cultural preservation that would retain the heritage of this
soon-to-be changed community. Re-opening the theatre required a large investment from both
public and private entities focused on a market analysis-driven approach.

**History of the Howard Theatre.**

Designed by J. Edward Stork in 1910, the Howard Theatre was the first theatre in the
United States for African Americans and quickly became known as a premiere theatre for live
entertainment in the country (DCOP, 2005; Ruble, 2010). The building itself had characteristics
of the Beaux-Arts, Classical and Italian Renaissance styles featuring a statue of Apollo at the top
of the building playing a lyre (CinemaTreasures.org, 2013). The National Amusement Company,
a white-owned firm, owned and operated the theatre for a period before selling the theatre to Abe Lichtman in 1931, another white owner. Both owners hired African American management in the form of Andrew J. Thomas between 1911 and 1918 and Shep Allen beginning in 1931 (Ruble, 2010). Known as the “Theater of the People” that drew white and black audiences, the theatre featured a mixture of live entertainment ranging from musicians to vaudeville to the occasional movie (McQuirter, 2003, 11). U Street/Shaw’s own Duke Ellington led the re-opening of the theatre in 1931 after it had closed for a small period during the 1929 stock market crash. As a member of the “Chitlin’ Tour Circuit” the Howard was a standard tour stop for African American acts in the southeast. The theatre was a huge success running multiple performances a day throughout the 1940s and 50s that featured nationally-known and local jazz and rock and roll musicians (Ruble, 2010).

The theatre began to decline as many residents moved to the suburbs in the 1950s and 60s. After the 1968 riots the theatre closed. In 1974, the Howard Theatre was nominated for and listed as a National Historic Landmark (NPS, 2013). The previous year a group of concerned citizens formed the Howard Theatre Foundation with a goal of re-opening the theatre. The Howard re-opened in 1975, continuing its focus on African American entertainment with Go-Go bookings that featured DC’s-own Chuck Brown. Go-Go music had originated along the U Street corridor as a form of funk music in the 1960s. The mixture of funk, hip-hop and R&B music was unique to the Washington, DC region and was highlighted in the re-opening of the Howard as homage to the neighborhood’s collective identity (Hopkinson, 2013). Sadly, the Howard Theatre was unsustainable in the wake of the decline of the neighborhood and closed its doors in the early 1980s (Howard Theatre, 2013). In 2000, the theatre was listed on the Save America’s Treasure Program as an endangered historic landmark (NDC Academy, 2013). By the early
2000s, the Howard Theatre had been dormant for nearly 20 years with a crumbling façade, leaking roof, and rundown interior.

Those involved in The DUKE Plan saw the Howard Theatre as a potential community anchor that could revive the crime-ridden and undesirable 7th and T Street corridor that many residents viewed as a place to actively avoid (Card, 2012; Nadeau, 2012, Pomeroy, 2012). The Howard Theatre would serve as the lynchpin for a re-imagined “Howard Theatre Sub-District” that included the redevelopment of the theatre and associated plaza (to be known as Ellington Plaza) as well as the development of neighboring sites as mixed-use office-retail and work spaces. The redevelopment would also include augmentation to the Shaw/Howard University metro stop creating a welcoming experience to the neighborhood for metro riders (DCOP, 2005). According to the plan the Howard Theatre Sub-District would be:

…a vibrant center focused upon a revived Howard Theatre. The theatre will be restored to its original and historic façade and will be well-programmed with local and national performers who attract day and night patrons. Performances recall the time when, in the Theatre’s heyday, legendary greats…honored their artistic craft and set a standard for excellence in the performing arts. Performances will be affordable to patrons who will be a range of local residents, visitors and tourists…Sub-District properties will be programmed to complement and support a “complete” destination with restaurants…Ellington Plaza…will become a small restaurant/entertainment zone celebrating the legacy of the Howard and surrounding neighborhoods (DCOP, 2005, 14).

Using a market analysis approach, The DUKE Plan recommendations included reconstructing the interior of the Howard Theatre as a 500 to 600 person space with additional uses including a museum, restaurant, and gift shop as opposed to creating a fixed 1,200 seat theatre space that had at one time been the interior layout (DCOP, 2005). The realization of this vision would face city budget constraints, private-public partnership negotiations, a few scandals, and an economic downturn.
Restoration of the Howard Theatre.

The restoration of the Howard Theatre took on a deregulated development model that leveraged city resources with private and non-profit investments, piecing together the funds needed for the project. In doing so, pressures were to not only restore the Howard, but restore it in a market-savvy manner that would reap economic benefits for investors. Shortly after The DUKE Plan had been adopted, Howard Theatre Restoration, Inc. (HTR) was formed as a 501(c)(3) organization that would work in partnership with city government along with other private and public entities to restore the Howard (HTR, 2013). Due to the economic downturn, the ability to fundraise for the project became difficult. Rather than pursue a public-private partnership (also known as a P3), both the city and HTR openly pursued the project as a P5 project which collaborates among neighborhood residents, philanthropic, public, private, and non-profit sectors creating a diverse web of stakeholders. The primary stakeholders included the city which provided staff, political support and roughly $8 million while the HTR worked with the Ellis Development Group to manage the restoration (Mosaic Urban Partners, 2013,
HTR, 2013). The HTR continued its involvement throughout the process as the owner of the renovated theatre and channel for the non-profit and philanthropic financial resources for the project. Howard University and other institutions provided small donations to see the project through.

The project took a great deal of money and seven years to complete. According to The Ellis Development Group (EDG, 2011) the total cost to restore the Howard was $29 million. The multi-sourced financial deal included city, private, and non-profit resources. The city contributed $8 million in the form of a grant from the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development’s Office along with a $4 million TIF bond, new markets tax credit, and historic tax credit. The city’s financial contribution was the first of its kind. This significant contribution was used in coordination with a $7.1 equity investment from US Bank and $5 million dollar construction loan from Eagle Bank. Additional support came from the National Park Service’s Save America’s Treasures Program ($350,000), Hampton Roads Ventures ($10,000), Mid-Urban Atlantic ($5,000) as well as smaller contributions from Howard University, the Philip Graham Fund and individual donors. Finally, DC Housing Enterprises, a non-profit subsidiary of the DC Housing Authority, provided new market tax credits and an allocation investment of $11,000 (EDG, 2011, DCHousing, 2013).

The Ellis Development Group was headed by Roy “Chip” Ellis and his brother, Malik, both black, multi-generational Washingtonians. In 2008, Chip Ellis signed a 75-year lease to rehabilitate the theatre and also hired the Nicholas Goldsborough Group as a fundraising consultant (Plumb, 2008; Castro, 2010). Just one year later, the HTR board was under scrutiny due to the lack of separation between board members and those providing services and thus being paid by HTR funds. In 2009, Charlotte Fox was fired as HTR’s Executive Director as she
questioned conflicts of interest among board members. In November 2008, Chip Ellis stepped down as Chairman due to Fox’s concern over conflict of interest. Another board member, Mickey Williams, also provided accounting services for which he wrote himself a check out of HTR funds. The non-profit was subsequently audited by the Deputy Mayor of Planning and Economic Development under then-Mayor Adrian Fenty (O’Connell, 2009). These allegations of conflict of interest do not diminish the final result of the fully restored theatre, but call into question the relatively small network involved in the actual restoration of the theatre.

The reconstruction of the Howard Theatre began in 2010, prior to the finalization of the project’s budget. During this time Chip Ellis and members of the HTR Board worked to inform the public about their construction plans that followed the recommendations of the culturally-framed redevelopment strategies in The DUKE Plan. At the event at the Shaw library in December 2010, Ellis described his passion for the theatre and how it could once again serve as an anchor in the community that would bridge young and old audiences:

**Chip:** …When I saw it [the Howard Theatre]…it was that this history is just way too important to lose and we can’t allow that to happen and it’s such an icon, but the history at the beginning would be lost because it’s just been 30 years since its doors closed. And so you know there’s a lot to be done to re-educate people. Several generations have gone now and people don’t know that it’s the oldest theater for African, major theater, for African American entertainment in the country. They don’t know that it’s older than the Apollo Theater by 30 years. Um, they don’t know these things and it’s really important that we re-educate not only this DC community, but the rest of the nation and the rest of the world. In the communication age that we have now, we have that wonderful opportunity to really tell our story and one of the pivotal things we are going to be doing with the development of the Howard Theatre and we are hoping that the community and history committee of Howard Theatre Restoration will really help this organization do is collect a lot of this memorabilia, collect oral histories because we want to build an addition off the back which is in the design and we want to actually have a museum first of all. We want to have a listening library for young people.

You know I think that’s really critical about…and that’s what keeps me going because you know we don’t want to lose that great heritage of music that’s done by actually artists physically playing the different instruments and being able to appreciate those musicians for their craft. Um, and I think there’s a real opportunity for this community and for everyone out here to get involved and to help whether it’s helping up
collect the history, whether it’s you know somebody who might be able to give money or a corporation that might give money. The addition is going to cost us about $3.5 million to build and that’s not a lot of money in the scheme of things, but we like to keep that the Phase I which is what you’re seeing know. I don’t know if you’ve been by the Howard Theatre yet, but we have started construction...Um, we’d like to be able to continue the construction into Phase II which will be the addition off the back that I just told you about. And um, there’s so much historical archives and things that we need to collect for this museum and I know that some of you people out here that are geniuses in that area of history um, and um, either album or photographs or know somebody that has incredible history that we can go and do oral history with. It’s going to have to be a real concentrated effort because we only have so much time. Hopefully we can raise this money over the next year and we can be ready to do (Ellis, 2010).

In 2011, Ellis and the HTR hosted a press event to show the progress on the reconstruction effort. The press reports provided accounts of the newly completed interiors that afforded room for 650 to 700 people seated or 900 to 1,000 standing including a renovated stage with DJ booths and a new basement with bathrooms, green room, dressing room, and kitchen. Seventeen windows from the original façade were restored while aspects of the 1910 and 1940 façade were combined to give the theatre new life (Muller, 2011). The lack of parking associated with the Howard Theatre was solved by providing parking at an adjacent development that was also being overseen by Ellis (ANC1B, 2010).

On April 12, 2012 members of the city, Ellis Development Group, HTR and other contributors stood proudly in front of their awesome accomplishment. The HTR lived up to its goal of restoring the theatre as “Neither identical to, nor different from the old theatre, but rather a state-of-the-art continuum” (HTR, 2013). HTR brought in New York-based operator, Blue Point to manage the operations and programming for the theater. The theatre regularly books African American-focused music and live entertainment, including gospel brunches on Sundays combined with making the space available for community events (Howard Theatre, 2013). Ten year U Street/Shaw resident and community politician, Brianne Nadeau commented:
**Allison:** Were you happy to see the Howard Theatre realized?

**Brianne:** That was something the ANC [1B] worked on... Tried to support as much as we were engaged. I mean sometimes in a good way, sometimes in a bad way. There was some controversy because we were asked to support the fundraiser for it at a very high level and the fundraiser didn’t necessarily engage Ward 1 residents... I mean how great is? That that [the Howard Theatre] is open? I mean it’s beautiful and it’s *like a beacon of rejuvenation*, you know [Emphasis added.] (Nadeau, 2012).

The restoration of the Howard Theatre was, as Brianne stated, “a beacon of rejuvenation” for the remaining section of the U Street corridor that had lagged behind in its redevelopment. The restoration of the theatre and its adjacent and nearby parcels re-created a more welcoming space for residents and visitors to change the area perception of the 7th Street corridor as a place to avoid. However, the consequences and changes to the neighborhood resulting from this redevelopment project calls into question the ability for the Howard to serve as a community rather than simply an economic anchor.

![Figure 5-2: Restored Howard Theatre and Ellington Plaza. From: Author.](image)

**Community Anchoring and Growth versus Equity at the Howard Theatre.**

The framework through which the Howard Theatre restoration and continued operation has been structured creates an environment in which the theatre must continue to place greater emphasis on economic prosperity rather than community outreach. The stakeholders involved, management structure, programming and displacements associated with the project are evidence
of a pro-growth agenda rather than maintaining equity in the neighborhood. Areas where the theatre could continue to serve as a social anchor include their outreach programs and involvement of the remaining long-term community and creating opportunities for positive long-term and new resident interaction.

_The DUKE Plan_ process had a high participation rate during which residents expressed a desire to see the Howard Theatre be restored to its former glory as a community anchor that positively benefited the population culturally, socially, and economically. In order to see this project realized, the city and HTR had to concentrate on fundraising more so than community involvement. The vested stakeholders, for example, (besides the city and HTR) are mostly global financial institutions who are interested solely in seeing a return on investment. Therefore, when it came time to find a theatre operator, a well-known successful operator outside of the DC area was chosen to assure that the theatre would generate a profit. According to Natalie Hopkinson, a scholar of U Street/Shaw’s musical heritage:

**Natalie:** The Howard is doing promotions from a non-DC based company, Blue Point, out of New York and that gets them access to national acts that could draw in people from beyond DC. Local acts don’t have as much access. If Chuck Brown…now they do the Go-Go Monday thing, but that—if Chuck Brown had not passed away [in May 2012, just one month after the Howard re-opened], there would have been no Go-Go access to the Howard because the New York promoters are not interested…in the indigenous culture.

The choice for a non-DC-based operator calls into question the ability for the Howard Theatre to serve as a social anchor in the community as few local acts are able to gain access to the venue. However, the programming at the Howard Theatre has remained centered on African American entertainment maintaining the cultural anchor status of the theatre and possibly one of the last large performing arts spaces on the corridor that actively attracts nationally-known African American acts. The theatre hired a non-native, celebrity chef, Marcus Samuelsson, to design the dining menu and prohibition-style cocktail list in order to attract higher-income clientele.
(Frederick, 2012). Natalie’s comment above suggests the theatre’s programming emphasizes acts that will attract those who live beyond DC. The theatre’s intended audience spurs questions of who actually will frequent and enjoy the renovated Howard Theatre in the wake of gentrification in this small section of the neighborhood.

Howard Theatre is located just one block from the largest agglomeration of place-based Section 8 housing that remains in the neighborhood. The majority of these buildings are homes to multi-generational Washingtonians and long-term residents. Recently, a number of the buildings have concluded their 30 year leasing contracts with the federal government that provide the ability for lower-income residents to afford to live there. The conclusion of the contract gives management companies the option to change their building to market-rate buildings that would force low-income residents out of their homes as they would not be able to afford the new market-rate rents. The advocacy group, ONE DC has been integral in helping current residents negotiate continuations of Section 8 leases in small increments, typically for one year. Lincoln Westmoreland II, one of the larger complexes with 121 units located on the 8th Street, NW between R and S Streets announced in January 2013 that the management company would exit the Section 8 program in May of the same year (EastShawDC, 2013). While the Howard Theatre’s restoration marked a rebirth of a “Black Broadway” landmark, many long-time residents are now being pushed out due to the forces associated with its redevelopment. Ellis’ other project, Progression Place, above the Shaw/Howard University Metro Stop will house a mixed-use building including office space for the United Negro College Fund. The development also includes 205 housing units, of which, only one quarter will be priced for low-to moderate-income residents who make 60 to 80 percent of the average median income.
(Neibauer, 2012a). These changes make benefits of the Howard Theatre’s restoration to long-term community residents hard to find.

However, outreach efforts of the Howard Theatre have proven HTR and Ellis have made good on some of their promises. An Oral History Day hosted at the theatre launched an Oral History Project to document the history of the art and cultural community related around the Howard on December 1, 2012 (HTR, 2012). While there is no evidence of a subsidy for low-income residents for tickets, the price for attending Howard Theatre events is fairly affordable compared to the neighborhood’s other music venues ranging from $17 for Go-Go Mondays to $35 for the Howard Gospel Brunch on Sundays (Howard Theatre, 2013). The theatre also offers reduced rates for space rentals to non-profits for community events. In 2013, HTR hosted a special Senior Christmas Concert for low-income persons (NDC Academy, 2013).

In regards to the project’s economic impact, the restoration created 100 permanent jobs, 40 of which were held by local DC residents. One hundred construction jobs were generated with 10 of those being set aside for public housing residents. Twenty-eight permanent jobs were also set aside for public housing residents. DC Housing Enterprises helped locate residents appropriate for these positions or referred residents to training programs in order to acquire the positions (NDC Academy, 2013). In order to realize its potential as a community anchor The Howard Theatre must continue to engage in such partnerships and programs to build its capability to bridge social capital. However, the issue remains that the displacement of large numbers of long-term, low-income residents such as those in Lincoln Westmoreland II and similar housing complexes will result in a dearth of an indigenous community for the Howard to serve. Ten years from now, the Howard may find itself in the same position as the neighborhood churches, attracting residents who moved or were pushed out of U Street/Shaw. The project’s
economic viability concentration has come at the cost of losing place-based, long-term social networks within the neighborhood. The theatre’s ability to bridge social networks between old and new residents has not been realized.

**Lincoln Theatre: U Street/Shaw’s Lost Jewel and the Trials of Community Ownership**

During a July 9th public oversight roundtable in 2012, DC Councilmember Vincent Orange stated the audience and testimonies at the hearing were all united in their interest to enliven the “jewel of U Street, The Lincoln Theatre” (Orange, 2012). Opened as a first-run movie house since the early 1920s, the Lincoln had been one of the largest theatres in Washington, DC that served the black population. Despite the care that had been taken by community members and the city to restore the theatre in the early 1990s it “did not lead or even seem to ride the crest of this cultural and redevelopment wave” that occurred along the U Street corridor (Clark, 2012). The theatre was aptly located directly across from the U Street/Cardozo Metro Station that began operation in 1991 and next to Ben’s Chili Bowl. Yet, the large amount of foot traffic did not lead to packed houses at the historic venue. In his recent work chronicling the neighborhood Blair Ruble (2010) notes, “The restoration of the Lincoln Theatre became contested between the African American community and pressure to serve the city as a whole” (278). The on-going saga of keeping the lights on at the Lincoln provides a case study in the struggles of community ownership of an anchor with limited outside financial support. Similar to the case of the Howard Theatre, government takeover of the management of the Lincoln Theatre suggests a continual outsourcing of neighborhood-based human capital and heritage in favor of economic profitability.

**History of the Lincoln.**

The Lincoln Theatre opened in 1922 as a 1,600 seat vaudeville and silent theatre, but the majority of its life was spent as a first-run movie house (Ruble, 2010). The theatre was designed
by Reginald Geare who partnered with theatre operator Harry Crandall. In 1927, Abe Lichtman assumed ownership of the Lincoln; now holding the reigns to both the Lincoln and the Howard Theatre down the street. Lichtman added a ballroom to the rear of the theatre that was called the “Lincoln Colonnade” that operated as a public hall hosting events from “battle of the bands” to club get-togethers (McQuirter, 2003). There was also a club called the Cotillion Room where visitors would enter through the back of the theatre and was one of the only places in DC during the 1920s and 30s where blacks and whites could dance together (WAMU, 2010). The theatre drew the well-known faces of U Street/Shaw from the music, academic and political worlds as well as the white elites. For example, former Executive Director Eilene Lifesey proudly stated, “FDR had an event there [at the Lincoln Theatre]” (WAMU, 2010).

During the 1940s through the 1960s the Lincoln maintained its status as the premiere movie house in the neighborhood. The Lincoln and Howard were run as complements to one another by owner Abe Lichtman with the latter focusing more so on live entertainment. The Lincoln began to struggle after desegregation in 1953 (Roberts, 1994). After the 1968 riots, the physical structure remained intact apart from the Cotillion Room which was destroyed (WAMU, 2010). The theatre was managed by various owners throughout the 1970s until it finally closed its doors in 1982 (Thomas, 2013). One creative owner during this time attempted to split the theatre into two so the venue could increase potential profits by hosting two events at one time; creating the Lincoln “Twins” which ultimately failed (McQueen, 1981).

The theatre became the focus of the corridor’s revitalization in the late 1980s and early 1990s when a northwest, white Washingtonian, Jeff Cohen, owned a couple of acres surrounding the corridor including the Lincoln and the 12th Street YMCA discussed in the previous chapter. Cohen’s redevelopment plan, “Jackson Plaza,” had an estimated project cost of $250 million that
eventually ran the developer into bankruptcy in 1990 (Dedman, 1990). In order to save the theatre, the city bought the property and worked to complete the project. The city gathered a group of historians working in the area (e.g. Kathy Smith and others) to help in the restoration and nomination of the theatre as a historic landmark (McQuirter, 2010). During this process the Lincoln Theatre Foundation (LTF) was established comprised of a group of concerned citizens who formed a group to bring back the Lincoln. The city hoped to re-open the theatre as a 1,350 seat space for the performing arts and bestow management and operation responsibilities to the Lincoln Theatre Foundation (Ruble, 2010).

The Lincoln Theatre held a grand re-opening under Mayor Kelly’s administration in both 1993 and 1994 (the former was a “sneak preview”; Mills, 1993). The city had provided a sizeable economic investment in the theatre including a $4 million loan from HUD in 1989 that went towards Cohen’s restoration and a total of $9 million more to complete the restoration. In a 2010 interview, Lifesey argued that the restoration of the theatre “became the anchor, along with Ben’s [Chili Bowl], to restore a building to its [the neighborhood’s] historic grandeur” (WAMU, 2010). The LTF was committed to showcasing African American talent and hosting events including The Duke Ellington Jazz Festival beginning in 2005 and the immensely popular Sophisticated Ladies in 2010, a music revue centered upon Duke Ellington’s music and legacy, put on by Arena Stage when the theatre company was using the Lincoln as a temporary space (Ruble, 2010; WAMU, 2010). The play and the festival were some of the theatre’s only successes. The theatre was closed the majority of the time and made most of its revenue off local rentals to arts-related and other community groups (Brown, 2012). In order to offset the

---

12 Ruble (2010) describes Cohen as being actively engaged with the community and well-liked among community members.
Lincoln’s revenue gaps, the city often provided small capital injections ranging between $250,000 and $500,000 to help keep the theatre afloat (Graham, 2012).

The DUKE Plan marks the Lincoln Theatre as one of the anchors of the cultural destination neighborhood, but provides little additional funds to rejuvenate the area further. The “Lincoln Common Sub-District” included the west section of U Street with the Lincoln Theatre and metro station serving as its center. The city recommended making the place more pedestrian friendly and installing public art at the metro escalator along with an area where street events such as farmer’s markets could occur (DCOP, 2005, 31). The only other mention of the Lincoln occurs later in the document stating:

Existing cultural facilities should be provided assistance, as needed, to expand and improve their cultural offerings. The Lincoln…in particular are critical to the storytelling about the Project Area’s heyday and to the mixed use and health of the Project Area in the future (DCOP, 2005, 44).

13 As part of the effort to make the Lincoln Sub-District more pedestrian friendly, the U Street corridor from 9th Street, NW to 14th Street, NW is currently undergoing a streetscaping project to repair and construct sidewalks, landscaping, install granite curb gutters, update traffic stops, update stormwater drainage, install new parking meters, install streetlights, install a decorative sidewalk in front of the Lincoln Theatre (U Street NW Streetscape Project, 2013).
In 2007, another former manager, Janice Hill, would press the city for assistance. She informed then-mayor Adrian Fenty that the theatre might have to close permanently causing DC government to commit another $200,000 and a possible annual budget allocation to maintain theatre operations (Ruble, 2010). Finally, in 2011, Councilmember Jim Graham publicly announced the theatre was broke and asked for addition funds. As acting Mayor, Vincent Gray responded by stating the city would assume ownership and bestowed management to the DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities (DCCAH) until the theatre found an answer to its current business model which was not sustainable (Neibauer, 2012b). A year later, Graham complained openly about the mismanagement of the theatre by both the LTF and the city government:

…there were a lot of things last year [when the Lincoln’s financial struggles were a highlighted by the press] that irritated me. None more so than the repeated suggestion that the Lincoln Theatre received gobs of DC government money. As anyone who knows…the Lincoln was kept on bread and water year after year after year. The Lincoln proceeded on the theory that if we establish a non-profit board that non-profit board will be writing checks and getting checks and everything will go along swimmingly and this jewel of a DC government asset can effectively be forgotten because we will have shifted the responsibility to another group of people. And the fact of the matter is…it didn’t work as well as was anticipated (Graham, 2012).

Despite its limited success and need for public funds, the theatre had been a bastion of community ownership and a long-term community social anchor since it re-opened in 1994. The new direction of the theatre that would be decided upon by the city with mediated community input placed the future of the theatre and its potential as a community anchor at the crossroads.

**Restoring the Management and Operations of the Lincoln: The Tension between Community Ties and Profits.**

In late 2011, the financial future of the Lincoln Theatre was abysmal causing the city, LTR, the creative industries, and non-profits in the city to confront how arts infrastructure was being supported across the broader area. The Board Chair for DC Advocates for the Arts, Robert
Bettman (2011) argued that the Lincoln and other local theatres were victims of “a Trickle Up Effect of reduced earned revenue.” In essence, local arts institutions, historic and otherwise, were competing over a smaller pot of financial resources and being forced to rely largely on local rentals to make up their revenue gaps. The change in focus on rentals caused theatres to shift gears towards booking large non-profits over smaller, perhaps more community-oriented non-profits causing a negative impact on the “neighborhood-based arts economy” proffered by Stern and Seifert (2010). The stakeholders involved in creating a path to economic stability for the Lincoln were faced with resurrecting a troubled community anchor by abandoning its status as a social network hub. The positions of each stakeholder, the LTF and the city, will be discussed in order to understand the complexity of the Lincoln Theatre’s government makeover followed by an analysis of the path chosen to structure the theatre.

The Lincoln Theatre Foundation (LTF).

The LTF had been involved in the restoration of the Lincoln Theatre and its operation and management since the early 1990s following Cohen’s bankruptcy. Members of its board included some of the longest-running black-owned businesses and residents of the U Street corridor. Both Rick Lee of Lee’s Flower Shop and Kemal Ben Ali, the son of Ben’s Chili Bowl’s founder and current restaurant manager/co-owner, each held a position on the Foundation’s board and served as Chairman (Ali, 2012, Lee, 2012). The Foundation had also attracted the prowess of talented and experienced arts industry professionals such as Bonnie Nelson Schwartz who had produced portions of NBC’s Olympic coverage in Barcelona (Schwartz, 2012).

While locally-oriented, the LTF had been publicly ridiculed as mismanaging the Lincoln Theatre financially and programmatically in the press throughout the latter part of 2011 into 2012 (Neibauer, 2012b). At the July 9th, 2012 public meeting to discuss a path to sustainability for the theatre, former members calmly pointed out the issues surrounding the Lincoln Theatre
were not problems that could easily be solved under the purview of the LTF or any other entity.

These problems included the on-going rental revenue problems faced by current-manager Darlene “Star” Brown:

**Darlene:** The other thing I would like to add...something about the rentals and there was time, several years actually, that Councilmember Graham provided what we’d call a “subsidy” for community, I’d say community-based organizations, and this subsidy covered quite a bit of their performances and when that ceased, the fact of the matter is, a lot of community organizations stopped coming to the Lincoln, stopped choosing to do their events there. I still do have relationships with national promoters whether it’s Live Nation, AEG, 9:30 Club and so I still do straight rentals with them, but I cannot sit here and say that the fact that the community organizations’ absence hasn’t taken an effect on the theater because it has.

I will say for some years now outside of rental revenue the problem, in my opinion, has always been programming. In house programming. Um, limited fundraising. Um, some years back we had a really amazing resident artist program, like series, kind of thing. Um, we haven’t had that in a very, very long time. And combined, I would honestly have to say that it’s been pretty basically it’s caused some type of demise to the theater. And I sent a one-page something to one of your directors, um, providing some background about a week ago and in that document I did state that for anyone to think or even presume that rental, the Lincoln Theater being a rental revenues stream operating type of venue, um, to think that that would carry the theater would be a huge mistake. Um, it doesn’t work. I think I’m fabulous, brilliant, I think I’m...because I do, and I work super, super hard, but it’s never been enough. It just isn’t (Brown, 2012).

Kemal Ben Ali and Rick Lee echoed Brown’s sentiments while also pointing out the physical, fundraising and city-revenue limitations. Ali (2012) pointed out that the available 1,200 seats (the post-1994 restoration seats available) was an odd number to book events and acts as the space was too large to be a community theatre, but too small to cover the costs of mainline acts that could be booked in larger venues throughout the city such as Warner Theatre or DAR Constitution Hall. In addition, the rental revenue did not generate enough, if any, profits that could be put towards in-house programming for the large theatre causing the lights to be off more often than they were on. Lee, as the most recent Chairman, argued that the $250,000 that was earmarked to the Lincoln Theatre never came in a timely manner resulting in the theatre’s
accounts dipping into the negative until the money came through. “It’s like Christmastime,” Lee (2012) said, “and you have a bunch of IOUs instead of Christmas presents.” The issues of rental revenue, lack of programming ability, and contention with city support aside, the LTF worked to retain the theatre as a community anchor.

When the city took over the theatre in 2011 it laid off the majority of the staff except for General Manager Darlene “Star” Brown. The former staff primarily consisted of long-time residents who continued to show up to help maintain the theatre as volunteers after the city takeover according to Brown:

**Darlene:** I’ve been solo for the most part since November 4th [2011]. I brought in an ex-employee, now a volunteer, part-time…that I paid out of my pocket to assist me for some months. In addition to that I will say that the very dedicated and loyal staff that was laid off…to this day still and will show up whether it is to clean up or to assist me, to check on me, or do whatever they can do. They are the same group that will come in and execute performances.

The role the Lincoln served as a social and to a certain degree cultural anchor continued through its darkest days. As such, the LTF insisted that the new operators continue to work with the members of the LTF and larger community as illustrated by Bonnie Nelson Schwartz’s testimony below:

**Bonnie:** The city is not and probably should not be a landlord, but a financial partner in running the theatre, enabling the Foundation to give the community a voice and a role in its operations as we have heard is so desired by previous speakers. [If a community-based solution was not financially feasible]…perhaps we should return to a commercial presenter to fulfill that role and return the theatre to a fully run operation with a provision for community subsidies (Schwartz, 2012).

Schwartz’s sentiments for the resurrection of the theatre were supported by the LTF: keep management in the community or outsource operations to a commercial presenter with subsidies to the community to maintain the theatre’s presence as an anchor institution.
The city was tired; tired of holding onto a sinking ship and receiving criticism for it by the public and the press (Freed, 2013b; Neibauer, 2012b, 2013; Schweitzer, 2012). Mayor Gray’s stance to transfer management and operations of the Lincoln to the DCCAH represented the end of the city’s patience with the LTF and its financial struggles. With the Howard Theatre opening its doors in April 2012, the city felt it was time to make sure the realization of both theatres as anchors outlined in The DUKE Plan was finally realized. The city’s position was to, first, stabilize the theatre financially, and second, find a partner who would commit to making the theatre profitable, and third, maintain some semblance of community engagement. Placing the responsibility of this within DCCAH was somewhat unconventional. DCCAH served primarily as a granting agency to support arts, arts organizations, and public art throughout the District. The Commission also engaged in arts education. It was not an organization that was well-versed in the operations of a theatre (Adams, 2012). The awkward placement of the responsibility for the Lincoln to DCCAH may signify the city’s intentions to create a quick handoff to an outside owner or operator.

While the city was primarily interested in establishing economic stability or “sustainability,” as stated by Mayor Gray, DCCAH seemed understood the social and cultural importance of the theatre to the long-term population (Bettman, 2011). In a conversation with, Moshe Adams, the Director of Grants and Legislative Affairs for DCCAH, he describes the Commission’s sensitivity to community input during the summer of 2012:

Moshe: It [The Lincoln] is a very unique space…It’s not the Howard Theatre. It’s just more of a neighborhood theater so the community has traditionally been involved…well the community has traditionally felt a part of it because there was a non-profit that was heading it and now we want that same community involvement…because especially with the Lincoln Theatre there are people who have lived there, who had, this is their 3rd generation of being in U Street and now they see all this stuff happening and they are feeling pushed out. So to give them that voice, it’s just invaluable. And I didn’t realize
how important that was until I started, like my second year here…um and just dealing with grants.

I think with U Street it’s a bit different because with all the new developments what I see is people are holding on, I think neighborhood folks are holding on to what they can. Like grasping onto what they can and…so there is a lot of emotions that are involved when it comes to U Street and you have to take that into consideration because there is so much that’s new. I live here, I’m not from DC, but there is so much that has changed already and is still changing and that is a good thing because it develops the city and DC is booming. However, when you displace people physically and then you displace them emotionally or mentally you know that has a big…so I see why this is now at the top of our list every day we tell the Deputy Mayor, “Lincoln Theater, Lincoln Theater, Lincoln Theater.”

The nuanced approach for community involvement was appreciated by members of the LTF and community residents. However, the DCCAH received clear orders from the Mayor and his Deputy Mayor on Planning and Economic Development suggesting that DCCAH did not have autonomy in their decision-making for the future of the Lincoln Theatre. By the end of the hearing on July 9th, 2012, it was clear the city was committed to finding a new operator to start generating profits for the venue (Orange, 2012).

**Go big or go home: The city’s commitment to economic anchoring.**

On August 3, 2012 less than one month since the hearing on the Lincoln Theatre, the DCCAH released a request for proposals (RFP) for a new operator. Determining a new operator involved coordination with different agencies within city government. DCCAH worked with the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, Office of Contracting and Procurement, and Office of Government Services to issue the RFP and develop a contract to retain a new operator (Adams, 2012). Then, nothing happened. The Lincoln remained quiet outside of the revamping of the venue’s HVAC and sound system. In December 2012, DCCAH released a second RFP as the Commission stated publically that the first RFP did not have quality applicants. The second RFP revealed the city had chosen to lease rather than license the theatre to a commercial or non-profit operator for five to ten years, with one five-year option for
renewal. The desired applicants were required to have at least ten years of experience operating venues with at least 400 seats (Neibauer, 2012b).

The setbacks did not deter DCCAH’s attempts to elicit community engagement in the decision-making process. However, their efforts to do so were met with criticism. The community feedback session was held two months after the release of the second RFP on February 26, 2013 at the Lincoln Theatre. The Commission was not able to provide specifics regarding how comments would be integrated into the decision-making process and could not provide answers to specific queries on the applicants (Schweitzer, 2013). Those in attendance expressed their desire for the theatre to retain its ability to be a space for local artists, non-profit organizations, and youth programs. Hence, residents at the meeting hoped to keep the theatre a community-oriented theatre (Freed, 2013b). A major concern of the audience and the DCCAH representatives was the ability for the Lincoln Theatre to complement rather than compete with the beautifully restored Howard Theatre down the street. One woman commented, “We don’t need the Howard Theatre to put us to shame anymore…we need to wake up” (Schweitzer, 2013). DCCAH Director Thomas stated the city would continue their involvement with the Lincoln in terms of its upkeep and maintenance (DCCAH, 2013a). The majority of those who attended the meeting left with their questions unanswered and feeling a lack of transparency in the city’s decision-making process.

Two months later, in April 2013, DCCAH announced they had selected a new operator for the Lincoln Theatre, whose proposal included a resume of quality arts programming and commitment to helping the venue “support the financial wherewithal for the Theatre independent of District government funding” (Neibauer, 2013). In April 2013, there were rumors that the owner of Blues Alley in Georgetown, Harry Schnipper, may have been selected as the new
operator. Schnipper, a white Washingtonian who has owned Blues Alley for almost 20 years, had previously announced he offered to purchase the theatre from the city in 2011 (Schweitzer, 2012). If this was the case, long-term community residents felt the theatre would have gained a DC-based operator that had a greater understanding of importance of the venue as a community anchor, as a place for African American live entertainment, and perhaps even maintain the local staff. If the operator was announced as a non-local promoter, it would have suggested that the city has chosen economic freedom from the Lincoln over the sustainability of a social anchor.

Instead, the city made an intriguing decision to lease the theatre to a well-known local operator that could financially stabilize the venue, make it profitable, and had been a well-known presence in DC live entertainment since 1986. On June 27, 2013 Mayor Gray announced that I.M.P. (standing for It’s My Party), owners of the 9:30 Club located at 815 V Street, NW, had been selected as the theatre’s new operator (DCCAH, 2013b). Co-owners of I.M.P, Seth Hurwitz and Richard Heinecke, had developed a proven track record as independent promoters within the Washington Metro Area. Hurwitz is frequently interviewed by local media outlets and has been dubbed “the region’s kingpin concert promoter” (Reinink, 2012). A resident of Bethesda, Maryland, Hurwitz honed his skills as a promoter in Washington, DC, primarily through the 9:30 Club and later as the operator of the Merriweather Post Pavilion (an outdoor venue in Columbia, MD) that currently produces the annual Virgin Mobile Festival each year among other nationally-recognized acts (Le Blanc, 2009).

Hurwitz and Heineke have conducted business in the neighborhood since the late 1990s when the 9:30 Club moved locations from downtown DC to the U Street corridor. During its tenure in U Street/Shaw the success of the 9:30 Club has helped strengthen the identity of the neighborhood as a cultural destination. Yet, I.M.P. is not a choice that represents the mission of
promoting African American live entertainment as desired by both the LTF and community residents who were present at the DCCAH-led public forum. Rather, I.M.P. is well-known for booking alternative and up-and-coming rock bands associated with the musically-inclined lifestyle of second-wave gentrifiers (LeBlanc, 2009). Hurwitz stated his elation with I.M.P’s selection as the Lincoln’s long-term operator, but did not show a dedication to provide future programming for its former core audience:

> It's an honor and a thrill to be entrusted with bringing new life to such a wonderful old theatre. Who doesn't love places like this? You walk into it and gasp every time. To be able to make this more a part of people's lives here again is an opportunity that is truly a privilege. There are so many kinds of shows that we are not able to do at 9:30 Club that we will now have a place for, including many that we had to take out of the city. Although we have been doing this for 33 years, we have added very few venues in our family roster. But this one we couldn't pass up. The Lincoln is just too cool not to do (Hurwitz, 2013 as quoted in DCCAH, 2013b).

The management of the Lincoln Theatre is in a state of flux until I.M.P. finalizes their contract and officially takes over the venue in September 2013 (Lincoln Theatre Staff, 2013). The choice of I.M.P. by the city indicates the on-going transition of power, culturally and economically, from long-term African American residents to first- and second-wave gentrifiers. As a result, the production of authenticity becomes further removed from those being honored through cultural preservation.

**Community Anchoring and Growth versus Equity at the Lincoln Theatre.**

The current path the city has chosen for the Lincoln Theatre provides an answer to the struggle Ruble described occurring within the Theatre in 2010:

> Thus, the struggles between the visions of U Street as a restored family-oriented home to African Americans and U Street as an economic resource were being played out inside the Lincoln Theatre (Ruble, 2010, 282).

The saga of the Lincoln Theatre Foundation displays the commitment and dedication that are required to maintain a community anchor that serves a neighborhood socially, culturally, and
economically. For the city it seemed that the ability for the venue to function independently financially was far more important than maintaining community ownership and critical engagement as the role of the LTF continues to be undefined in the future of the theatre.

The future of the Lincoln Theatre under I.M.P.’s management remains unclear and uneasy for some stakeholders. The theatre continues to be run on a shoestring budget from the city with only Darlene “Star” Brown listed as staff on the venue’s website (Lincoln Theatre, 2013). Prior to announcement of I.M.P. as operator, the silence surrounding the Lincoln has caused some of the press to consider if the city would sell the venue if it could not find a suitable applicant (Neibauer, 2013). This option may remain on the table if I.M.P.’s efforts do not provide results. For some, the re-imagination of the theatre by I.M.P. is long overdue, but calls into question who will be the audience for the theatre. Natalie Hopkinson (2013) considers the past and future of the theatre to be directly tied to the racial politics of the city:

**Natalie:** They [Lincoln Theatre] should be rolling in money. For all the access to the public that they have. Again, it has been branded black so it’s hard to get non-blacks. And it can’t survive on blacks because the area is not all black any more. It could never be able to do it for a consistent basis. But the promoters are local people, DC people and that is different than the Howard.

Natalie’s sentiments that the new operator of the Lincoln Theatre would attempt to attract a broader audience is now a reality. The Lincoln is a formidable façade that directly faces the entrance of the U Street/Cardozo Metro stop and is also aptly positioned next to one of the largest tourist draws on the corridor, Ben’s Chili Bowl. The potential for the Lincoln to draw in a large crowd, no matter their origin, is a highly desirable asset for the city and the new operator. In doing so, the entire public life of the corridor may change as outsiders are drawn to the Lincoln for large events despite the lack of parking associated with the venue (Lee, 2012).
The ability for the Lincoln to serve as a community anchor may have passed. With the LTF now defunct, it continues to have concerned stakeholders with no clear authority or role in the future of the theatre. After its renovation the Lincoln was never a bustling cultural anchor other than its ability to provide rentals to locally-based organizations. The theatre’s ability to fulfill this role is commendable and needs to be maintained in order to achieve a “neighborhood-based creative economy” that is grounded in the neighborhood’s cultural identity (Stern & Seifert, 2010). In this case, the ability to balance cultural, social, and economic anchoring proved to be too difficult a task for either stakeholder (LTF or the city). The city’s actions continue to show a penchant for economic vitality above all else in their stakeholder role along the U Street corridor.

Comparing the Howard and Lincoln Theatres as Past, Current and Future Community Anchors

Community anchors carry a heavy burden. They serve as touchstones of a neighborhood’s cultural identity, social network hubs, and local economic engines. The Lincoln and Howard Theatres developed their positions as community anchors organically due to the limitations segregation placed on access to entertainment and other opportunities for the local black community. Once segregation ended, the theatres floundered to identify their new role and market within the city with each eventually closing their doors. Pro-active citizens concerned with the preservation of cultural landmarks and The DUKE Plan turned the spotlight back on these institutions and their importance within the community historically and in the future. The path of rejuvenation for both the Howard and Lincoln Theatres reveals the differences in each venues physical attributes and interactions with the city that informed the redevelopment process and ability to serve as a community anchor.
The physical footprints of the Lincoln and the Howard are different and determine the kinds of events and entertainment that can be programmed at each venue. Moshe Adams (2012) compared the program offerings that may occur at each theatre:

Moshe: It’s [Howard Theatre] is a very different venue. It’s smaller…It’s very different to program a 600-seat intimate, cabaret-esque theatre than the Lincoln Theatre which I think is 1,250 occupancy. So off the bat there is a big difference in just general programming. You can’t do the same show at the Lincoln that you would do at the Howard. The Lincoln, you could have Broadway show easily, at the Lincoln, it’s actually bigger than a lot of Broadway houses. The stage itself is bigger whereas the Howard is a smaller stage, smaller capacity and it’s a bit more controllable.

The smaller space and addition of a kitchen to the Howard Theatre make the newly renovated space more marketable for a wider variety of events that can fill HTR’s coffers. The Lincoln has a large physical footprint and permanent seating arrangement that restricts the types of events and programs that can occur in the space. The physicality of each theatre had repercussions on the ability for each governing foundation, HTR and LTF, to manage and program their venues in a marketable manner. LTF, being forced to rely on local rentals, may also have suffered from a loss of rentals due to the Howard Theatre’s more versatile space offerings. The physical attributes contributed to the ability for each theatre to serve as a community anchor and maintain a commitment to social preservation versus economic sustainability.

The city’s attitude and relationship with each theatre is vastly different. The Howard Theatre had the city’s formal backing prior to the adoption of *The DUKE Plan*, but the adoption of *The DUKE Plan* cemented the city’s commitment to redeveloping the site and the 7th Street, NW corridor (DCOP, 2005, Adams, 2012). The city put a great deal of effort behind the realization of the Howard Theatre’s restoration as a state-of-the-art facility including staff, energy, and the creation of an innovative financing package (EDG, 2010). Comparatively, the Lincoln Theatre seemed to be the Howard Theatre’s ugly stepsister. The theatre was acquired as
part of a government bailout of Jeff Cohen’s failed redevelopment and restoration plan. The city put just enough resources into the theatre to see it restored, but left out key infrastructural improvements that would create a modern performance venue (Brown, 2012). Once the restoration was complete, the city quickly handed over the management and operation of the theatre to a non-profit group providing little to no resources in terms of staff or financial backing. After ignoring the theatre’s financial struggles, other than to fill revenue gaps, the city finally addressed the theatre once the Howard Theatre’s finances and project timeline were finalized. The selection of new operator, I.M.P. indicates the Lincoln Theatre will follow the Howard Theatre’s programming emphasis on nationally-known acts. In both cases, the social hub aspects of the theatres were ignored in favor of economic growth.

The commonality previously shared by both the Lincoln and the Howard Theatre was a commitment to artistic programming for the African American community. Both institutions served as cultural anchors for the re-imagined, redeveloped “Black Broadway” described in The DUKE Plan. The choice of I.M.P. as operator of the Lincoln Theatre will potentially cut the venue from its African American live entertainment roots. Had the city chosen an operator like Harry Schnipper, who is dedicated to jazz music, a music genre historically associated with the African American community, the implications would have been two-fold. First, it would have displayed a commitment to the realization of U Street/Shaw’s place brand as well as a form of social preservation of cultural identity. Second, it would suggest an end of an era and a possible point of contention in the future. The demographics are changing and the local residents of U Street/Shaw may not be attracted to the largest entertainment venues on the corridor offering only African American entertainment. The theatres may have jointly witnessed a similar fate of the neighborhood African American churches. Residents may have come to dread Friday and
Saturday nights when former residents filled the streets to attend these venues. Instead, the city chose to diversify. The Howard Theatre will become the center for preserving African American live entertainment, while the Lincoln Theatre can be re-imagined to draw in a large audience including new residents and outsiders.

On the other hand, the ability for both of these venues to feature the entertainment historically offered in each space would have represented a commitment to social preservation that has not occurred in other aspects of community life, namely housing. The ability for each venue to continue to reach out to long-term residents and organizations may be critical in maintaining generational social networks and bridges between new and old residents and is highly questionable considering I.M.P.’s typical audience. In her experience of the “sneak peak” of the Howard Theatre, Washington Business Journal contributor, Jennifer Nycz-Connor (2012) was enthralled by the restoration stating, “Because even with all the changes [to the Howard Theatre], the heart of the Howard remains the same. Just renewed for all.” In the simplest of terms, this rose-colored interpretation of the theatre’s restoration does not touch on the politics in which it is immersed. The greatest tragedy for community members would be if these theatres remain almost as museums of what once was without engaging in a critical discussion of the neighborhood’s history and social contributions, creating a simulacrum of segregated, Washington nightlife marketed to the masses.

**Discussion at Anchor Scale**

Neither reincarnation of the Howard or Lincoln Theatre currently fulfill the role of community anchor within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood. Combining the contributions provided by economic anchor, social anchor, and cultural development theory provides a basic definition for what qualifies as a community anchor. A community anchor provides a place that
serves as a bonding and bridging social network hub that validates collective neighborhood identity while providing opportunities for economic advancement and profitability, particularly related to the creative industries and preservation. The Howard Theatre is able to balance economic anchoring for the redeveloped 7th Street, NW corridor as well as serve as a cultural anchor to a lesser extent due to the outsourcing of its operations to a New York-based company. In comparison, the Lincoln has been the lynchpin of a long-term resident social network for years that was recently dismantled without a new organizing mission. The theatre’s future as an economic and cultural anchor is uncertain, but will most likely come at the price of its social anchor role.

The contribution of this work’s findings to anchor theory suggests that community anchoring requires a diverse set of committed stakeholders that draw upon a place-based institution as inspiration for community benefits and sociality. Particularly within cases of arts-related anchors, issues of growth in the form of economic viability and equity in terms of social and cultural representation often are at odds with one another. In cases where anchors are city-owned or subsidized, the city should actively engage the community in its plans to assure that community buy-in and social anchoring is not compromised throughout the project planning and implementation process. For neighborhood organizations running anchors it is imperative to focus on both fundraising, securing city funds, and leveraging social network ties to maintain place-based control over operations and programming. If this does not occur there is a high chance that the community will lose control over the anchor.

In both cases of the Howard and the Lincoln Theatres, the neighborhood brand outlined in *The DUKE Plan* and adopted by the U Street/Shaw community as “Black Broadway” became the impetus for the structure and scope of the theatres as anchor institutions of a cultural
destination district. The following chapter examines the conflicts that occurred at the community resident level as the place brand for U Street/Shaw was absorbed into the everyday life of residents including business, popular culture and individual interactions.
Since 2000, local merchants along the 14th and U Street corridor have celebrated one of the hottest weekends in the year by hosting an annual sidewalk sale aptly titled, “Mid-City Dog Days.” On August 4, 2012, the event’s title lived up to its name with the sun sizzling the city’s sidewalks with a temperature topping off at 100 degrees. Yet, the topic of conversation among the event’s patrons from around the neighborhood was not the sidewalk deals, the produce at the farmer’s market in front of the Reeves City Center, or the heat, but rather a new buzz word that had taken the neighborhood and the city by storm in a matter of a few days. Swagger-jacking. In an editorial posted on The Washington Post’s “The Root DC” blog on August 3rd, a freelance writer and DC native named Stephen Crockett lamented the changes that were occurring along the 14th and U Street corridor which had been the epicenter of the city’s race riots in 1968. In the article, Crockett openly criticized and questioned the appropriation of African American culture for profit by local entrepreneurs arguing, “There is a certain ‘cultural vulturalism, and African American ‘swagger-jacking,’ going on on U Street” (Crockett, 2012a).

The term’s caché aside, Crockett’s article touched a nerve within the community, the city, and the nation. Within days, the article was featured on major media outlets such as The Huffington Post and Slate.com (Huffington Post, 2012; Slate.com, 2012). A commentary in response to Crockett’s arguments was featured in The Atlantic five days later (Franke-Ruta, 2012). The neighborhood’s blogs similarly were inundated with comments on the legitimacies of Crockett’s claims. Some adversaries contended Crockett’s opinions were common forms of lament and nostalgia that are associated with critiques of the effects of gentrification (Baca, 2012). However, Crockett’s internal questioning throughout the article hinted at underlying
themes and conflicts inherent in culturally-framed redevelopment that were unresolved within the community. Specifically, swagger-jacking captured the tension between development and economic growth and forms of equity such as inclusivity and affordability within neighborhoods experiencing change. Additionally, swagger-jacking entered DC’s urban lexicon at the same time as a critical mass of *DUKE Plan* projects combining cultural celebration and redevelopment neared conclusion. Within his article Crockett (2012a) asked, “Is it possible for a once black city to experience gentrification while opening businesses that exploit black culture?” The debate on that issue that ensued within the public sphere addressed more than a simple critique of gentrification, rather, it examined how a culturally-framed development defines and creates a sense of belonging in a place. In a direct conversation, the merits of community preservation and community change were confronted and discussed.

This chapter examines how the swagger-jacking debate erupted within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood as a critique of the latest form of culturally-framed redevelopment occurring within the community. First, swagger-jacking debate is contextualized within the culturally-framed redevelopment process and pertinent gentrification literature. Second, the term swagger-jacking is unpacked, defined, and discussed in relationship to its supposed culprits in the neighborhood. Third, an examination of the community conversation on swagger-jacking reveals how authentic cultural appropriation is determined by current community members. Fourth, the identity politics associated with the U Street/Shaw community and swagger-jacking are analyzed with special consideration to those noticeably left out of the conversation, the poor minorities within the neighborhood. Finally, recommendations are made for how to increase inclusivity at the individual-scale within a community that seeks to preserve a particular cultural narrative while experiencing dramatic market growth.
The Context at the Individual Scale: Resident Narrative Appropriation and Interactions

Producing authenticity, the amalgamation of cultural consumption and preservation, through the implementation of The DUKE Plan continues to engage a broad group of stakeholders from the city-level to the neighborhood-level in the intentional enhancement of existing or new cultural, art, and heritage assets. The dichotomy between the long-term resident housing struggle on 7th Street, NW and the booming gentrified business corridor on 14th Street, NW caused a number of residents (new and old) to feel uneasy or downright angry about the continued inequity in the neighborhood. Rising housing costs have limited the ability for long-term residents who are renters to stay in the neighborhood (ONE DC, 2013). Concurrently, businesses owned by new neighborhood residents and investors themed their enterprises around the “Black Broadway” narrative and African American musical contributions associated with the neighborhood. The tensions between displacement and economic growth culminated in the swagger-jacking debate. This section provides a contextual background for the swagger-jacking debate in relation to The DUKE Plan’s implementation and situates the interactions at the individual-scale within the existing literature on gentrification and social preservation.

The DUKE Plan Implementation at the Individual Scale

The swagger-jacking debate occurred during the culmination of numerous DUKE Plan projects including, but not limited to: the re-opening of the Howard Theatre, city overtaking of the Lincoln Theatre, redevelopment of Parcels 42 and 33 (Howard University/Shaw Metro), redevelopment of Rhode Island Avenue gateway, re-opening of the Watha T. Daniel Shaw Library, and O Street Market redevelopment project. Crockett’s (2012a) critique occurred during the final phase of culturally-framed redevelopment as businesses and other neighborhood entities began to adopt the place brand as a marketing strategy (See Figure 6-1 Below). As such, the swagger-jacking debate reflects an overall neighborhood-based discussion on the merits and
negative effects of culturally-framed redevelopment. Namely, the dialogue that followed Crockett’s article discussed whether the promises made within *The DUKE Plan* to benefit local business and maintain citizen engagement were realized.
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**Figure 6-1: Culturally-Framed Redevelopment Process Phase During Swagger-Jacking Debate (Outlined). From: Author.**

Participation in *The DUKE Plan* planning process was high, involving over 500 individuals in the consultation and public engagement stages that informed the policies and goals adopted by City Council (DCOP, 2005). Residents expressed a desire to see the neighborhood benefit from development through increased amenities and service provision, but were also savvy in their demands for direct benefits to current residents at the time of the plan’s adoption. The plan outlined use of inclusionary zoning and affordable housing provisions in new developments as necessary to preserve the ability for residents to be able to remain in the neighborhood. In addition, the plan suggested that the acceptance and support of the “Black Broadway” place brand would spur economic development for existing resident-owned businesses and entrepreneurs (DCOP, 2005, 12; DCOP 2012, 1). While there are a few examples of businesses that did benefit from the U Street/Shaw place brand, namely Ben’s Chili Bowl, a number of businesses failed or were displaced (Pomeroy, 2012). As mentioned in Chapter 5, a
number of long-term resident-owned businesses were displaced due to the development of Progression Place located around the corner from to the Howard Theatre (Hyra, n.d.).

Similarly, the city’s efforts to keep the community engaged in the neighborhood’s redevelopment were fragmented and intermittent at best. The DUKE Plan’s (2005) “African American Cultural Heritage” section, outlines the goal to:

Promote cultural tourism initiatives based on the rich African American historical and cultural assets of the area that will bring economic development opportunities for local residents and businesses (DCOP, 2005, 42).

The following recommendations were also provided to assure continued support of the redevelopment and use of the “Black Broadway” place brand:

8) Continue to convene a bimonthly Roundtable for all public and private partners to provide networking opportunities, focus on common issues of current importance, encourage collaboration, and pursue joint advocacy for program implementation.

9) Conduct surveys to test and refine initiatives’ acceptance, effectiveness and impacts (DCOP, 2005, 42).

Analysis of meeting minutes, newspaper articles, and interviews with neighborhood stakeholders failed to locate one instance since the adoption of The DUKE Plan where these recommendations were acted upon. The meetings and surveys may not have occurred, perhaps, due to lack of government resources, changing mayoral administration priority areas, or overwhelming amount of development occurring in the city. Rather, the city continued to engage the community about the various development projects associated with The DUKE Plan through its standard method of working with ANCs and neighborhood associations. In doing so, the city never held additional public meetings to discuss resident concerns about the implementation of the overall vision of The DUKE Plan, including each development project in relation to one another. Residents, therefore, were only able to glean an understanding of the plan’s implementation in a piecemeal manner as small-area projects required approval from neighborhood organizations. Finally,
residents were not asked about their opinions on the neighborhood’s changes specific to the intentional use of the “Black Broadway” brand. Without a formal engagement process in place, Crockett’s (2012a) swagger-jacking critique was poised to serve in its stead.

**Placing Swagger-Jacking within the Literature**

Scholars continue to study if long-term residents benefit from gentrification and neighborhood redevelopment (Brown-Saracino, 2010; Hyra, 2008; Woldoff, 2011). Cases in which residents have been able to benefit often occur in neighborhoods where existing residents own their homes rather than rent (Freeman, 2006). As homeowners, long-term residents benefit from increased amenities and property values. Few cases are found where long-term renters, particularly low-income earning residents, are able to stay in their neighborhood during or after the process of gentrification (Hyra, 2008). Proponents of redevelopment through investment contend that improvements indicative of gentrification benefit long-term residents within inner-cities by creating a mixed-income atmosphere. Interactions between old and new residents may lead to an extension of social networks and increased job opportunities in a growing local economy (Putnam, 2000; Wilson, 1996). Yet, scholars continue to find that mixed-income neighborhoods do not witness meaningful relationships across income groups that engender such results for long-term residents (Ellickson, 2010).

During her research in gentrifying neighborhoods, Brown-Saracino (2009) put forward the notion of a variety of gentrifier identities, instead of the monolithic gentrifier described by Neil Smith (1998) as a greedy property investor. She described gentrifiers as investors (pioneers), residents concerned with their community in relation to their quality of life (homesteaders), and most importantly, as new residents called social preservers who are intent upon maintaining some form of authenticity within their neighborhood in relation to long-term residents and their heritage. Social preservers have the potential to play a critical role in
preservation of affordable housing and cultural identity in gentrifying communities like U Street/Shaw. Not only do they leverage their networks and capital to protest for social preservation and invest in its maintenance, social preservers actively determine who are the “authentic” long-term or old-time residents in their neighborhood (Brown-Saracino, 2009). Scholars of multicultural city theory proffer increased engagement between long-term residents and new residents, particularly those that exhibit the characteristics of social preservers, can help in the creation of inclusive communities (Sandercock, 2003; Sarkissian et al., 2010). Examining the politics of the swagger-jacking debate contributes to the gentrification literature by considering issues of belonging in gentrifying communities, problematizing the role of social preservers, and evaluating engagement and dialogue between the city, long-term residents, and gentrifiers. The case of swagger-jacking in U Street/Shaw questions whether inclusivity during the planning process actually leads to equitable outcomes for existing residents.

**What is Swagger-Jacking?**

An exploration of the swagger-jacking debate reveals how questions of growth and equity are framed at the community level nearly ten years after plan implementation. In 2012, the majority of major projects outlined in *The DUKE Plan* had been started or nearing completion ranging from streetscaping to the restoration of the Howard Theatre on 7th Street, NW (DCOP, 2012). The effects of those projects had caused new business investors to buy into the narrative of U Street/Shaw’s redevelopment as “Black Broadway” evidenced by a critical mass of approximately 10 to 15 establishments with the once city block that referenced “Black Broadway” and other African American neighborhood icons. It was at this moment of market level appropriation of *The DUKE Plan*’s narrative that Crockett critiqued the redevelopment of
the neighborhood and questioned the authenticity of these establishments and new residents they attracted as well as the legitimacy for them to appropriate African American culture for profit.

**Defining the Term**

In coining the term, swagger-jacking, Crockett specifically refers to the use of a “faux black ethos” along the U Street corridor exhibited in new business establishments while the neighborhood’s demographics no longer exhibit a black majority (Crockett, 2012a). In questioning the clientele of these new businesses he furthers his arguments that swagger-jacking is a form of ‘cultural vulturism,’ stating, “That it isn’t FUBU (For Us By Us). I know now that I can hit up any of these places and hear the music of my past and walk outside and see a city that I don’t know” (Crockett, 2012a). Thus, swagger-jacking also entails a time component in which indigenous cultural identity and heritage are drawn upon or considered appealing or valid only after the indigenous population has dissipated to a certain tolerable degree at which point appropriation and consumption of cultural characteristics becomes unique, different, and a socially conscious and responsible act. Could this be urban renewal 2.0—redevelopment with a conscience? Crockett seems to question his own arguments considering that the neighborhood’s culture can’t be owned by long-time or new residents, “Culture is weird the way that air is weird: You need it, you breath it, but you don’t own air” (Crockett, 2012a).

While Crockett (2012a) is critical of the neighborhood’s basic improvements since many black residents have left, voluntarily or through displacement, he focuses his argument at the market level on new business establishments, but continues to question whether some form of preservation, be it watered-down, is better than nothing:

In a six-block stretch, we have Brixton, Busboys and Poets, Eatonville, Patty Boom Boom, Blackbyrd and Marvin. All are based on some facet of black history, some memory of blackness that feels artificially done and palatable. Does it matter that the owners aren’t black? Maybe. Does it matter that these places slid in around the time that
black folks slid out? Maybe. Indeed, some might argue that these hip spots are actually preserving black culture, not stealing it (Crockett, 2012a).

Crockett’s article was in fact aimed at two major business groups that combined own and operate all of the establishments he identifies as swagger-jacking the neighborhood’s culture: the Hilton brothers and Andy Shallal. In a community forum that was held nearly a month after the article was published, Andy Shallal, owner of Busboys and Poets, and another Root DC columnist, Clinton Yates described how they defined swagger-jacking:

**Clinton:** Swagger-Jacking, to me is I guess the most crude form of cultural perversion. When I think of swagger-jacking I think…essentially is when you take a part of the culture not to pay homage to it, but you take a part of the culture, you appropriate it without giving credit to the ones who actually developed it. Actually like taking credit for something or when you are placing a platform under the guise that you actually created this without giving due credit to the ones who actually created and gave birth to it.

**Andy:** I think anything that has the word “jacking” in it sounds aggressive like you are taking something away from someone unwillingly (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

Combined with Crockett’s original article, the definition of swagger-jacking based on community consensus refers to the appropriation of black culture for the purposes of pure economic gain by businesses.

**The Culprits and the Bandwagon**

Swagger-jacking fell into a few camps: new apartment buildings, new businesses, and long-time businesses that had increased in popularity in recent years. Andy Shallal, Eric and Ian Hilton (also reffered to as the Hilton Brothers) and neighborhood developers fell into the former category whereas neighborhood stand-bys such as Ben’s Chili Bowl and the Florida Avenue Grill were considered as latter beneficiaries of the neighborhood’s increased marketability. This section outlines the buildings and businesses accused of swagger-jacking.
Market-rate housing.

Two major developments drew upon “Black Broadway” icons—The Ellington Apartments and Langston Lofts. The Ellington Apartments were developed and opened in 2004 in a partnership between Donatelli Development and a black-owned firm Gragg and Associates. At the time, The DUKE Plan was in its final planning stages and the recently opened-now closed club, Republic Gardens, referenced Duke Ellington as a neighborhood icon. The developers chose to name the apartments “The Ellington” as a way to honor the area’s history. The Langston Lofts on 14th and V Streets was developed by Metropolis Development led by a former city Deputy Mayor of Economic Development, Merrick Malone, and his business partner, Scott Pannick (Franke-Rute, 2012). The Ellington Apartments currently rent for $2,450 for a 1 bedroom while the Langston Lofts are condominiums begin to sell at a little under $500,000 (TheEllington.com, 2013; DCCondoBoutique.com, 2013).

New restaurants and bars.

Andy Shallal owns two restaurants on the 14th and U Street corridor: Busboys and Poets and Eatonville. Busboys and Poets is located in the retail space of the Langston Lofts. The space was first going to be a Mattress Discounters, but Shallal convinced the owners that his restaurant would be a good space for the community while also being profitable. Shallal drew on the name “Langston Lofts” to create the concept of Busboys and Poets around Langston Hughes who worked as a busboy for part of his life while pursuing his career as a poet. Shallal created a cosmopolitan atmosphere in the expansive 7,500 square feet space including a bookstore featuring African American and progressive authors managed by a non-profit, Teaching for Change, a restaurant with gluten-free and vegetarian options, and a gathering space called The Langston Room for use for community events, book presentations, and forums such as the A.C.T.O.R. series referenced above. Busboys and Poets was such a success since its opening in
September 2005 that Shallal has opened additional locations in Washington, DC on 5th and K Streets, NW, in the Shirlington neighborhood of Arlington, Virginia and most recently in Hyattsville, Maryland. In 2009, Shallal opened Eatonville as a fine dining soul food restaurant based on Zora Neale Houston who lived in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood for a brief period in her life (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

In comparison to Shallal, Eric and Ian Hilton have grown a group of restaurants and bars in the DC area over a short period of time. The brothers opened the Eighteenth Street Lounge in 1995 as a “home base” for Eric’s band, the Theivery Corporation—a celebrated electronica collective, and their music label, ESL Records (McCart, 2010). The brothers briefly tried their hands at a sushi bar, Dragonfly, which quickly closed in Penn Quarter. Currently, the brothers operate a family business where Eric’s stepson serves as the restaurant group’s head chef. Eric develops the business concepts, largely around music and Ian runs the business-side of the operation. Since 2007, the brothers have opened five restaurants and bars along the 14th and U Street corridor that each draw upon the neighborhood’s black music history. Marvin opened in 2007 in honor of Marvin Gaye, who attended Cardozo High School in the adjacent neighborhood of Columbia Heights. Marvin features Belgian and soul food in reference to the time Gaye spent in Ostend, Belgium. DJs at Marvin play only Soul and R&B which draws in 150 people during the week and 300 people each weekend night (McCart, 2010).

The other restaurants that have since opened each reference a local musician or musical genre. Another short-lived Hilton Brothers venture was Blackbyrd, that opened and closed between 2011 and 2012, was named in honor of a former Howard University professor who headlined the group, “Donald Byrd and the Blackbyrds.” The speakeasy style bar, The Gibson, is named after a guitarist that frequented the Eighteenth Street Lounge. Patty Patty Boom Boom
features Jamaican fare and is named after a reggae song. Finally, The Brixton, which served as the hinge-pin of Crockett’s article, opened in the summer of 2012 as a British-style pub on the corner of 9th and U Streets, NW in honor of the multicultural neighborhood from which ska, reggae, and glam rock music originated (McCart, 2010; Crockett, 2012a; Busboys and Poets, 2012). The Hilton Brothers small dynasty in DC’s nightlife continues to attract wealthy, young professionals who eagerly spend the $20 required for a gelato float at The Gibson or hit up Happy Hour at The Brixton for a $4 Miller Lite.

**Old-timers find new life.**

Some locally-owned, black-owned businesses have continued to thrive despite the prolonged period of economic distress U Street/Shaw experienced after the 1968 riots until the early 2000s. For example, Ben’s Chili Bowl was opened in 1958 by Ben Ali serving half-smokes, hot dogs, and chili to neighborhood patrons. The restaurant stayed open during the 1968 riots by the request of black activist, Stokely Carmichael (Bean, 2000). The restaurant continued to be a mainstay throughout the construction of the U Street/Cardozo Metro across the street when many other local businesses began to struggle and close their doors. Since 2005, the restaurant has flourished through increased publicity when President Obama visited there in 2009 (Franke-Rute, 2012). A more up-scale version of Ben’s Chili Bowl with an expanded menu and full bar opened up next door to the original space in 2008 and the space above Ben’s Next Door currently hosts a neighborhood tourism exhibit run by the non-profit Cultural Tourism DC. Currently, two tour busses a day stop in front of Ben’s Chili Bowl in addition to the thousands of patrons that now flock to Ben’s outposts at The Nationals Ballpark and FedEx Field (Levey, 2010). Another Ben’s Chili Bowl is scheduled to open on the H Street, NE corridor within the next year. Besides Ben’s Chili Bowl other long-time businesses have grown in popularity such as the Florida Avenue Grill—a grubstake diner on the 1100 block of Florida Avenue. While other
long-time businesses such as Industrial Bank and Lee’s Flower Shop may not have seen such a steep increase in business, they are continually mentioned as cultural landmarks that maintain the authenticity of the neighborhood (Franke-Rute, 2012; Williams, 2003).

Swagger-Jacking Critics

Four days after the article was published, Crockett authored a follow-up commentary based on over 600 comments that were associated with the original piece. Crockett broke responses to swagger-jacking into five camps: those that considered him an idiot; those that wanted further clarification on what would be appropriate use of history in relation to new businesses; those arguing Crockett should build his own bar; supporters; and those that told Crockett to move to Anacostia (the current stronghold of the black, poor identity in the city; Crockett, 2012b).

The major debate surrounding swagger-jacking centered upon Crockett’s own questioning: is some form of remembrance of the neighborhood better than none? Columnists and commentators asked whether Andy Shallal and the Hilton Brothers should be supported rather than condemned for helping to highlight the area’s history. Garance Franke-Rute (2012)
argued in her article in *The Atlantic* that perhaps these establishments were “teaching a multi-ethnic/racial generation of Washingtonians about the history of the local scene?”

Those accused of swagger-jacking, such as Andy Shallal, wrote formal responses in *The Washington Post*. Shallal espoused he knew he was not swagger-jacking when, days before he opened Busboys and Poets, he allowed two elderly black women who were peering into the restaurant’s windows to preview the space. Upon viewing the murals of civil rights leaders the women cried, indicating to Shallal that his restaurant paid appropriate homage to the area’s history (Shallal, 2012). The debate continued caused Shallal to host a special community forum as part of Busboys and Poets A.C.T.O.R. [A Continuing Talk On Race] discussions on swagger-jacking in early September 2012. Debates continued to center on new businesses as opposed to long-term developments in the community despite Franke-Rute’s article in *The Atlantic* which outlined the relationship of development to the city’s strategic planning and investment in the neighborhood. Those businesses accused of swagger-jacking represent a change in U Street/Shaw’s demographics as well as who controls or exerts power within the neighborhood. This changing dynamic is directly related to how culturally-framed redevelopment, as implemented in *The DUKE Plan*, affected a sense of belonging and claims of legitimacy in the neighborhood.

**A Community Conversation: Swagger-Jacking versus Authenticity**

Since the adoption of *The DUKE Plan* there have been no public meetings on the plan’s progress and effects on the community. A community forum was held in the Langston Room at Busboys and Poets on September 2nd, 2012 to discuss swagger-jacking in relationship to the neighborhood’s gentrification. Crockett declined to attend stating he was “not interested in sitting in an establishment that sits under $500,000 loft apartments” (Sommer, 2012). The
discussion had five panelists: Andy Shallal, owner of Busboys and Poets; Clinton Yates, a columnist for The Root DC; Sheldon Scott, Marvin manager; Scott Pomeroy; and Maurice Jackson, an Associate Professor at Georgetown University in African American Studies. Andy emigrated from Iraq to Washington, DC as a child and opened Busboys and Poets during in 2005 during the second-wave of gentrification. Clinton Yates grew up in a multi-generational black Washingtonian family as a long-term resident. Sheldon is black and moved to Washington, DC from South Carolina in 2000s as a second-wave gentrifier. Finally, Maurice is also black and moved the Washington, DC after the riots and furthered his study in African American history and politics and still maintains his efforts as a local political activist. He considers himself a long-term resident. Each panelist provided their input on the issue of swagger-jacking while also openly discussing questions and concerns by those in attendance at the discussion.

The public forum was the first time in nearly ten years that community residents gathered to discuss how culturally-framed redevelopment, particularly, in the form of new businesses, affected their feelings of inclusivity and affordability within the community. The major themes touched upon included the appropriate use of culture for profit purposes, ownership of culture, and how authenticity should be defined within the neighborhood. The discussion presented an opportunity for the community to realize a goal of multicultural planning; an increased understanding of other cultures and cultural awareness through deep listening and dialogue (Innes & Booher, 2010; Sandercock, 2003; Sarkissian et al., 2010). The results of the discussion may not have ended in consensus, but revealed how belonging is redefined through community engagement at critical points in a gentrifying neighborhood. This section outlines how discussion of culture and authenticity interestingly supported the implementation and goals outlined in *The DUKE Plan* at the neighborhood level.
Culture and Authenticity

*The DUKE Plan* drew upon U Street/Shaw’s cultural identity during its heyday as a black entertainment district, between 1920 and 1950, because it was both a period celebrated by long-time residents and highly marketable. The cultural heritage drawn upon for the plan was relegated to focusing on African American arts and cultural history; primarily jazz (DCOP, 2005). In comparison, the discussion of culture and authenticity at Busboys and Poets defined the amorphous nature of culture and the rules under which culture can be appropriated and celebrated. Yet, the discussion of the neighborhood’s culture continued to be defined by the parameters established through the implementation of *The DUKE Plan*—African American culture and music. Authenticity of the appropriation of culture was defined in terms of a particular code of ethics mutually agreed upon by community stakeholders.

Those at the community forum agreed with the panelists and Crockett that culture could not be owned, but that appropriate use of a culture is directly related to market forces as well as nuanced forms of community engagement as indicated in the conversation below between Sheldon, Andy, Clinton, and the moderator:

**Moderator:** Can culture be owned? Can someone own it? Can we own black culture?

**Sheldon:** No more than a mother can own a child can someone own culture. I mean obviously you give birth, you nurture it, you give life, you give it direction, but ownership, um, I just don't think that can actually happen. It's too big of a concept to own.

**Clinton:** I agree with that. I don't think ownership is even the goal, I mean the goal is respect and recognition--to something he made a point earlier. I mean you could talk about who owns what. Does that really even matter, but things that we, just going to say, as part of a culture try to push forward and make a difference in it...to me it doesn't matter who owns it. If the impact can be made in the way the originators wanted to make.
**Andy:** It's like owning air. I think that culture is interpreted differently by different people--what culture is. And what parts of culture are interpreted differently by different people so I don't know if ownership plays into it either.

**Moderator:** The question is who decides that? How does one decide...how do you decide if Brixton is appropriate or inappropriate. Like what determines that?

**Clinton:** Well, it's still America. I guess greenbacks will determine if people think it's appropriate. But I think personally there's nothing that's designed in each one of us to try to determine that beforehand. That's something that you're going to figure out overtime and the only way that we are going to be able to learn with one another what appropriate is if we all care to actually contribute and not seem to point fingers at what should not be done. That to me is what makes the most sense. If you can all do it, then you figure it out amongst yourselves. You don't tell other people what they can or cannot do based on some preconceived notion of what should and should not be (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

The discussion amongst the panel indicates the theoretical and practical fuzziness that surrounds notions of culture and ownership, particularly in neighborhoods undergoing change. Rather than establishing definite parameters to what is right and wrong in reference to the appropriation of culture, the panelists argue that a combination of market forces and community interactions and engagement will determine what is considered permissible use of a cultural icon, identity or historical reference.

Authenticity developed as the dividing line between swagger-jacking and legitimate cultural appropriation by new businesses. Authenticity of businesses was defined as the integrity of the business owners in their use of cultural history or icons, reciprocity of the business back to the community, and appropriate recognition of the historical figure or place. Andy Shallal and Sheldon Scott each outlined how their businesses served to honor and recognize the historic figures their businesses were named after:

**Moderator:** What made you create a restaurant Langston Hughes? Why? Why did you do that?
Andy: Well, I mean it’s in a building that's called Langston Lofts. Um, when I came here the building already had a name. I remember going around and seeing buildings you know named Ellington. Uh, that had a Mexican restaurant, a Thai restaurant, and a tanning salon and it seemed odd that to put a tanning salon. [Laughter].

So when I saw Langston Lofts it was clear to me that they were trying to name it after Langston Hughes and so hopefully a place at the base of this building that had Langston Hughes' legacy attached to it somehow was the right thing to do, the only thing to do in my opinion. Originally, this was already in the process of being leased to Mattress Discounters and in the process of having a conversation with the owner of the space, uh, it was going to be two spaces. This space is about 7,500 square feet, was going to be two spaces and when I came here I saw the two spaces, but I didn't know that one of them had already been taken, or almost leased, and I had to negotiate to reverse that process, they had not signed the lease yet, to be able to take it on as Busboys and Poets because I thought it was important that what goes in a building—that it’s trying to hold onto a moment in time or history that transcends black or white. It's American history; it's this area's history.

It was important to me that that's going to be representative to what it's supposed to be representative of, which is Langston Hughes. And that's when I started to actually work toward that. So Langston Hughes represents more than just African Americans. He represents Americans in so many ways. As a kid coming here to America I learned his poetry, I memorized. We had a teacher who had us memorize Langston Hughes. You studied Langston Hughes in high school, middle school and the one of the most important poems that I read of Langston Hughes was "Let America be America Again" because to me as an immigrant coming to this country, that poem represented everything about America. It talked about the duality of America. The America. That is and the American that could be. And so I wanted to make sure that that was the part of Langston Hughes that was going to be brought out. The Langston Hughes that was political, was conflictive, who understood race in so many different ways, he traveled all over the world and saw that race was just some sort of weird construct that was created that has no place in modern society to really distinguish people by shades of their skin.

Moderator: Um, Sheldon, I call you the “Senator from DC” as far I’m concerned. You have had an integral part in how the city night life runs. A lot of people recognize you as the manager at Marvin, but you are intimately aware of all the other properties that are owned as this organization [the Hilton Brothers businesses]. Can you speak to the decision to name the venues after black artists like Blackbyrd and Marvin Gaye and even the name of Brixton?
Sheldon: Um, you know the man behind the big idea is Eric Hilton who is a musician and um a DC area native from Maryland. And we actually were in Bruges, Belgium together in 2004, when he came up with the concept with a Belgian soul food, um, bar at the time in honor of Marvin Gaye. You know the story behind the restaurant Marvin is it pays homage to the two years he spent in the seaside town of Ostend, Belgium where he kind of got his soul revival and it was a very bright spot in his life and, um, things really started to change around before he moved back to the US. And it was kind of...given a situation that being in a city where someone of that magnitude was born and raised and went to Cardozo High School, but yet the best we could have done in terms of a physical homage to him would be a park way out that was underutilized...and we came to the fact that back in 2000 that they actually tore down his birth home, I mean, could you imagine someone tearing down the birth home of Elvis Presley or you know Michael Jackson at this point…

So we came up with an idea that like later on, like 3 years later, the space came available at 14th and U and it just all made perfect sense…I mean we think of things and things happen, but there had to have been something in the universe that made that happen. There is a perfect time and place for everything. But it wasn't just about owning a place and putting his name on it and saying, "This is an homage to Marvin." It's not just what it is physically, but it is also what we choose to do with that space on the inside. You know there’s a sixth sense or energy that goes into the space so being very sensitive about what's happening on U Street, what has happened on U Street, and trying to create a space that will support both of those ideals…Um, but I feel like one of the things when you talk about responsibility, I feel like one of the responsibilities now is to continue to get that message out about Marvin Gaye and his importance and then message start or lead or assist in a movement back to memorializing in the way that he should be, not in a restaurant or a bar. I don't think that should be the biggest one (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

In addition to appropriate recognition, the panelists addressed the issue of cultural commodification. Andy and Sheldon argued that his restaurants went above and beyond a “typical business” by engaging in forms of community reciprocity that give back to the community from which they had drawn inspiration and on-going profits. Andy was dedicated to providing a space for community discussion and interaction, while Marvin highlights the music that historically defined the neighborhood.
Newer Female Resident: It sounds like we are talking about commodification of culture so it’s this idea that we are packaging and reframing African American culture for the consumption of people who have the means to purchase it, um and I am wondering what are the implications of that for the way that you run your businesses and whether that has a negative impact on the community itself because it is true that culture is dynamic and that it changes and it transforms and it becomes whatever it is going to become, but this idea that there is this concern that we are creating this sort of Disney-fied version of you know African American culture on U Street given its historical legacy. So then what does that mean for how businesses are run, the authenticity of those businesses, that kind of thing? Does that make sense?

Andy: If I could take a stab at that? Um, we don’t see ourselves as sort of Disneyfication of black culture here in this space certainly. Uh, Busboys and Poets is not just named after the great African American poet Langston Hughes, but it does lots of events and programs. When we first opened this place we invited Teaching for Change which is a local non-profit that brings social justice and civic materials to schools here in the district. So we brought them here, the non-profit to start our bookstore. We want to have a bookstore because bookstores are places where education begins where information is available. And we wanted to have a space that isn’t just about naming it after an icon, but really about kind of digging deeper and giving back not only to the community, but to the whole idea of Langston Hughes and what he was all about.

So having a place that has a room that we call the Langston Room where we have a stage where we have these types discussions, where we have on-going authors and poets and speakers and all kinds of people come and speak about this stuff, we have full events where we bring in people like Harry Bellefonte, people like Alice Walker or Nikki Giovanni, all those people that otherwise may not come to this area if they did not have a space like this that is welcoming, loving and nurturing for that kind of environment and that kind of event. So we do lots of that kind of stuff I think on a regular basis… [It is] a different environment than you would otherwise have that is unique and exciting and nurturing to a culture that I think has for a long time been suppressed in this area since the riots. So I want to be able to make some distinctions and say what we do here is really more than just have a name on a shingle and say this is it. This is what African American culture is about. We go much, much deeper, we have on-going discussions and things like that allow for that opportunity to really flourish and grow.

Sheldon: I think on the other side of that same coin, this is not for you Andy, you speak for your restaurant, I’ll speak for my restaurant. It’s not the Smithsonian Museum of African American History. That is not what we are, that is not what we pretend to be. I mean we have a very niche, very small. Like everything about it is small-scale. It is just
an itty-bitty homage. It’s nothing; it’s miniscule compared to like the size of culture which we alluded to earlier. You know what we were trying to do there was just create a space where people can come in and feel comfortable, you know, people who have been here for all their lives, 60-70 years to people who just moved there 6 to 7 days ago because that is the truth. As a business, our primary goal is to make money, you know it’s a business, it’s not a philanthropy. But coming into a space like that you have to pay some kind of homage to the history of the place. We do the best that we can and we just do that in practice. And all I can just say is come. You don’t have to pay to get into Marvin. You know no one has to pay. If you want to come from anywhere, it doesn’t cost to get in. If you don’t want to drink you don’t have to drink. You can still enjoy the music, you can still enjoy the DJ and what you just do is create a space where people can come and enjoy themselves and if that happens to be a majority African American or black crowd then so be it (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

Sheldon’s candid answer illustrates a key point in the swagger-jacking debate. Businesses by their very nature are not tasked with the mission of preserving culture or the population associated with the culture they appropriate for a business concept. Blatantly missing from this conversation is the role the city played in adopting a particular narrative through which to frame redevelopment and bolster economic investments. Throughout the discussion the city’s involvement in the neighborhood’s redevelopment was noticeably absent. Instead, references were made to market forces that generally were causing displacement or voluntary movement of the neighborhood’s long-time and indigenous residents.

When pressed further, Sheldon did provide an example of how Marvin gave back to the community. In doing so, Sheldon and Andy contend that businesses and gentrifiers, rather than government, are the bastions of cultural preservation in the wake of economic growth.

**Sheldon:** Um, of course, there is always room to do better, um, but when you say living up to that legacy, like I say it’s not about what you do on the outside, it’s not about the music and food and it’s also about the other side that I feel is a lot more personal side. You know Marvin’s; someone said to me after the article, “Well, maybe you guys should do some more giving.” And, but one of the few times I’ve ever done this is, I kind of listed what we kind of do in terms of giving and I think it’s a zealous, it’s a very prideful thing to go out and tell people, well you know I give this, I give that, I do this, and I
support this because that’s not the point of it. But I think since it’s a part of the conversation people do have to understand that there is a huge amount of give back. There is a huge philanthropic piece of it.

For instance, if you talk about Marvin Gaye Day Celebration... every year we’ve done that that’s always been the entire day of sales is a complete day of donation and for the past two years I’ve worked with Marvin’s daughter Nona and his ex-wife Janice Gaye and his grandson Nolan Gaye as to determine what particular charity they feel would best suit their respective fathers, ex-husband’s and grandfather’s image. I mean to put it in numbers, at a minimum it’s an $8,000 a day kind of give. So and I think on the other level too you talk about the give in the community you know we always made an effort to hire people from within the neighborhood and people come and work and do something...and they have some kind of perspective and you know, but it’s a small company. You know it’s 100 or so employees and if you’ve got that then maybe 10-15% of people are from the neighborhood historically that maybe remember that place as something different. But is there something that we can always do, of course. And are we always open to that, of course. We humble ourselves with the fact that in this man’s name we are bringing something to the community and we are obligated to carry out that legacy in how we practice business. Whether that’s green, that’s cool and that’s giving (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

In these passages, Andy and Sheldon validate two current theoretical arguments surrounding issues of gentrification and cultural preservation. First, in her work, Brown-Saracino (2009) argues that social preserver gentrifiers, those that move to a neighborhood interested in a community’s existing residents and characteristics who strive to maintain a particular sense of place, define authenticity in a neighborhood. For example, Andy and the Hilton Brothers each purposefully identified African American culture and music as the authentic identity and culture associated with U Street/Shaw in concert with The DUKE Plan narrative. In doing so, authenticity is further defined on the street through African American history as opposed to blacks currently living in the neighborhood. Focusing on the history of U Street/Shaw separates, to an extent, the preservation of historical community identity from the long-time residents who may face issues of displacement due to out-pricing.
Second, the social and political power exhibited by social preservers like Andy and Sheldon questions how growth and equity will be balanced in the future. Sheldon currently sits on the local Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC 1A) located just north of U Street/Shaw. As mentioned in Chapter 2, this government body makes recommendations on new businesses, liquor licenses, and proposed developments and rezoning applications. In addition, these entities work with other neighborhood groups to negotiate community benefits agreements with large-scale developments that may occur within the neighborhood. Sheldon’s position on the ANC along with other social preservers rather than long-time or indigenous residents indicates how authenticity and issues of equity may be framed in the future—through a pro-growth lens.

What Actually Happened to Long-Time Local Businesses and Residents?

The DUKE Plan had promised an increase in opportunities for local entrepreneurs (DCOP, 2005). In 2012, the evidence was that the implementation of the plan had in fact supported entrepreneurs, but primarily new entrepreneurs. Scott Pomeroy noted how media coverage that centered on the displacement of blacks from the community in the early 2000s actually hindered the development of long-term resident black entrepreneurship along the corridor.

Scott: African American and black businesses as a whole, there has been um, one of the roles that I played was the Executive Director of the 14th and U Main Street program back in the early 2000s. And during that time frame we had more African American owned businesses open up on this corridor than had opened up in the previous several decades…a number of them are still open, a number of them are not, but a lot of that was self-fulfilling prophecy of people talking about the decline of the black owned businesses that were here when they were struggling trying to open up their businesses. Marcia Duval who was the owner of Trade Secrets wrote a very good editorial in The Washington Post about that talking about just that particular circumstance that you have to be able to look at what is here, I’m not going to lie that at that same time we also had as many more businesses opening up from other cultures including African cultures, like
the Ethiopian businesses and Somalian and a number of others that opened on the corridor, so there is a wide diversity, but at that same time, you still had the largest increase of African American owned businesses occurring. But it was a multicultural opening that was occurring and that got lost in that whole picture because what was lost in that same time frame was the sense of this really being the heart of the African American culture.

**Moderator:** Quick question, what did you mean when you said “self-fulfilling prophecy?”

**Scott:** Uh, we had a number of owners and other individuals that were here talking about the decline of the black-owned businesses. How all of them were being forced off the corridor and at the same time we had so many that were opening up. So when every newspaper talks about the fact that they are being forced off of the, out of the area, then that’s chasing away the customers...when you say that all of the black-owned businesses are being forced off the corridor and you continually say that out in the public to all the customers that would be coming to the businesses (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

Would the black-owned businesses in the early 2000s have stayed open if they marketed themselves blatantly within the “Black Broadway” narrative? Scott’s observations note how perception of the changing identity of a place can drive business in both a positive and negative direction. In this case, the growth of the neighborhood negated the equitable distribution of success amongst business owners.

In addition to locally-owned businesses, the community forum continually touched upon those who were no longer or outnumbered within the community. Who was responsible for displacing long-time residents who represented the culture being preserved? Who was responsible for creating a way for those residents to stay in the community? According to the forum, this was outside the realm of business and inherently the duty of government.

**Moderator:** How does institutionalized racism play into this issue of gentrification? Because the reality is that the criminal element that black people have been scared of since the 1960s is the same criminal element that white people are scared of, so why is it that services do get better when the block gets whiter? [Clapping from audience].
Andy: I mean this is huge. You are absolutely right, I think Pamela hit it right on the nail and I think that’s the underlying story that came out of the swagger-jacking article. You are absolutely right. I think the part that puts a little question mark in my mind is it puts the onus on businesses to sort of solve the problem. And really this is much bigger than that. Government has to get involved. Government has to get involved because you are right. Gentrification has some good things right? Great roads, you are actually going to find fresh vegetables at a supermarket. Those are things everybody wants whether you are black, white, or any other color. So that’s not the issue. The issue is how do you prevent gentrification from tipping over from creating this sort of unwelcoming pushing out of you know raising the tax base so you can’t pay for the home that you’ve been living in for many years. Those need government involvement. Without government involvement you can’t really put any reins on gentrification gone wild (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

Andy’s argument that was agreed upon by most of those in attendance reveals an integral issue within gentrifying neighborhoods, particularly those who undergo culturally-framed development.

The DUKE Plan openly condoned market-rate housing through mixed-use development. The primary form of equity for existing residents was evidenced in cultural heritage efforts, recognition and a commitment to some forms of affordable housing—primarily mixed-income housing—which only address a portion of existing residents. As such the equitable distribution of African American culture did not create opportunities or spaces for many low- and middle-income earning existing African American residents to remain in the neighborhood as argued by Maurice Jackson:

Maurice: Just generally, you know because we can give many examples, but you know we are talking about hundreds of thousands of people. You know, the average white family income in Washington is about $100,000. The average black family income is about $39,000. Great discrepancy. People cannot afford to buy houses when an affordable house is $400,000. So you have many questions. The black unemployment is twice what the white unemployment rate…and the cost is about 30% which is the highest in the country. No jobs are being created; no training programs are being created. So one can talk about many things, but one has to give people the right to stay in a place if they want to stay and that is a problem. It is beyond…people don’t have the opportunity to
stay in this city (Busboys and Poets, 2012; See Appendix B for descriptive statistics on U Street/Shaw and Washington, DC to compare to Jackson’s statistics).

The reality of long-term resident displacement still plagues the issue of swagger-jacking. How can businesses draw on an area’s history when that population is no longer present or recently outside of the population’s majority? Who belongs in these spaces and who does not? For the panelists this question of belonging was what you make of it—boiling down to involvement and on-going community dialogue. Scott referenced a previous effort to brand the neighborhood as an Arts and Cultural District that was headed up by two white women, each having lived in the community for over 20 years and how that form of swagger-jacking differed from businesses and housing.

**Scott:** Yeah, I want to build off of what Sheldon was saying and there are ways that you can get involved, but it really is important to also identify where it is that you want to make the difference. Because the ANC has all kinds of different things that’s on its agenda that might not necessarily appeal to you and they’re not always the most friendly and inviting environments to get involved in for someone that’s really just wanting to do something for the community and not get wrapped up in all the politics that’s involved. But I would want to say that in identifying what you’re looking to do, find out how to collaborate with the others that are around you. As he was saying for the community benefit agreements. Those are some very powerful things if the community can actually figure out what it wants to agree on….I was here for what was the DC Arts District Banner Project for funding and if you want to talk about swagger-jacking to me that was one of the biggest pieces of swagger-jacking...

**Sheldon:** AMEN.

**Scott:** When they started to talk about selling the culture here when it really was just branding this area from a development standpoint and it took away some very valuable resources that were needed from the people that were actually doing the work in the community. So it’s a matter of this dialogue has to move beyond the dialogue of what are the course and objectives for retaining and preserving what are the pieces of the culture that we want to see preserved and how do we, be able to move on because it is always going to be changing, so how do we recognize that change, but also work with the communities that are here so that we don’t just wipe out what’s already been here (Busboys and Poets, 2012).
Through community dialogue the current residents of U Street/Shaw continued the swagger-jacking debate and drew three main conclusions through an open discussion of the merits and critiques of Crockett’s article. First, swagger-jacking is the crude marketing of cultural identity with no form of integrity, reciprocity, or recognition of the person, place, or aspect of culture being appropriated. Second, the businesses named as swagger-jacking actually exist on a continuum of offenses where those businesses that engage in reciprocity and recognition are in fact not swagger-jacking according to business owners. In these cases, authenticity of a business is defined by the community and its acceptance or lack thereof of the business. Third, it is not the role of businesses to consider or provide answers to larger questions of equity within the community. Rather, government should provide safe guards to mitigate displacement of long-time residents. This stance becomes particularly problematic when business owners or managers also hold government positions as in the case of Sheldon Scott. Scott placed the burden of safe guards for low-income and long-term residents to local governments. For Scott and Shallal, businesses are open to the public and thus engage all community members who choose to enjoy and consume their celebration of neighborhood culture. These conclusions do not fully answer the questions proffered by Crockett (2012a) or the plethora of comments generated by his article. Through this dialogue, the so-called swagger-jackers, Andy and Sheldon diminish the role and responsibility of businesses to deal with the harsh realities of gentrification and cultural appropriation, yet continue to question the use of culture in community assets from businesses to buildings to landmarks. Moreover, these conclusions do not adequately address the underlying issue Crockett promulgated: are these places legitimate now that the indigenous population is largely missing from the U Street corridor?
The public forum also validates culturally-framed development and *The DUKE Plan* as a successful form of redevelopment. Throughout the discussion all participants accepted the narrative of “Black Broadway” as “the history” of U Street/Shaw and the appropriate way in which to recognize and redevelop the neighborhood in a socially responsible manner. In doing so, the veil of cultural heritage masks the larger issues of displacement and redefining a sense of belonging on the street.

**Who Belongs Here? Cultural Belonging, Swagger-Jacking, and Sense of Place**

The projects implemented as part of and in concert with *The DUKE Plan* dramatically changed the look and feel of the U Street corridor. In the early 2000s many vacant lots and derelict properties remained, attracting their fair share of illegal activities (Pomeroy, 2012). As one of the members of the audience mentioned, “We may not be entirely happy with how the community has changed, but at least less people are being murdered” (Busboys and Poets, 2012). Similar to other case studies of gentrification, residents expressed a general approval of the increased amenities from stop signs to better access to fresh foods as a result of redevelopment (Freeman, 2006). Dissatisfaction with the change in the neighborhood arose around two major themes: a sense of belonging in the neighborhood and the identity and class politics surrounding swagger-jacking and the community at large. This section describes how social preservers, including “swagger-jacking” businesses, support a new definition of who belongs in the neighborhood that is directly related to issues of class and multiculturalism.

**Racial Belonging: From Chocolate to a Multigrain City**

The 2010 Census exposed that Washington, DC was no longer Chocolate City—a moniker the city had held since the 1970s. African Americans held a slight majority at 51% of the population with whites comprising the next largest racial group at 35%
(Morello & Keating, 2011). These racial shifts were accompanied by a rise in the average family income of over $110,000 (NeighborhoodInfo DC, 2012). DC was becoming a “Multigrain City” where the ability to successfully navigate integrated social settings would become the norm (Cashin, 2012). It was noticeable to many long-time residents that as the city became more integrated, wealthier, in essence, gentrified as a whole, the certain characteristics that defined the Chocolate City identity became increasingly marketable to social preserver gentrifiers of various racial backgrounds.

Local writer and historian of DC’s Go-Go music genre, Natalie Hopkinson (2012) argued in The Root DC just before the Busboys and Poets discussion that, “arts and culture are the early-warning systems…They foretell what happens on the policy side, and what eventually will be a new reality.” Hopkinson’s arguments related to the “changing flavor” of a city as a result of culturally-framed redevelopment. The policies outlined by The DUKE Plan, while attempting to be inclusive, also seemed to pre-memorialize the absence of a culture that was soon to be displaced as new residents moved to the neighborhood. For long-term residents, these forms of redevelopment, swagger-jacking included, were insidious and isolating along racial lines. During the meeting, a middle-aged, black, long-term female resident stood up to express her fears related to belonging in a “Multigrain City” that was met with confusion by Andy Shallal:

**Long-term Female Resident:** And I don’t want that lost while we dance around this issue of culture or swagger-jacking, this new term or even the benefits that we do have in preserving some of the home rights and the rights in general of the population that was here before. I believe what Crockett got to and what my brother from Baltimore was talking about was there is this larger issue that black people in this city feel and as Brother Jackson talked about rightfully so, of this feeling of the city is turning into something that is not a welcoming place for me anymore and those who look like me. [Room erupts in clapping]. And so that underlying feeling that current that swims through this discussion I think, is one that we have to talk about and one that we have to face about how we do things differently and how we face those things. So I wanted to put that in the room and I wanted to actually have you all talk a little bit about that underlying
issue of race.

Andy: The part that sort of confused me about the article is how is it that a place like Busboys and Poets or Brixton’s making your argument. What you’re saying it’s making it less welcoming for people. That’s what I need to understand.

Long-term Female Resident: What it is it’s, see I think what happens is that conversations about race are not only difficult for white people. They are difficult for people of color too. They’re difficult for us too sometimes. You know, but and I think, you know in this argument that maybe he had difficulty. In fact, he had in his article lots of questions. Is it appropriate? Should they come? Should I be talking about this? I think it was the difficulty of the conversation to maybe just put it out there as, “This is a race thing.” I feel I don’t want the city to be a majority-white city, I like it as a majority black city and if black people want to say as Maurice said, “Why isn’t there room for us to stay here?” So, maybe it was a difficulty in the discussion (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

In the passage above two members of a community undergoing change are unable to connect on a basic issue of a feeling of comfort and belonging. For the woman who grew up in a poor black-majority city, she continually feels that her needs and wants as a resident are being overlooked in favor of strategies that continue economic growth in the city and the population that brings that growth—upper-class residents. Places such as Busboys and Poets as well as Marvin attract residents with money and residents with higher education levels seeking out certain types of experiences and commodities. In this environment, the woman, despite Andy’s efforts to create a comfortable place for all community members, feels out of place and culturally, socially, and mentally isolated within an increasingly multicultural, multiracial neighborhood.

Nostalgia surrounding Chocolate City is not held by all long-term residents. For some younger residents, multiculturalism is how they define the identity of Washington, DC as Clinton describes below:

Clinton: Hold on, if you don’t mind, if I said one more thing. There’s another thing that you talked about the underlying concept of what is, what is believed to be you know this racism factor that is an undertone. There is also something that needs to be understood that there is a large generation of people that grew up in this city as a multicultural place
from the jump therefore their mindsets aren’t automatically held on the notion of the glory of Chocolate City and that’s not a problem. It’s just something in terms of age and generation and the way we’ve come as a country that is real. You know people talk about Go-Go and all this other stuff as if the only things that could be defined culturally in DC are the things in which a certain group of people have chosen to define about it. People don’t talk about groups like Bad Brains…you know all-black punk rock groups you know what I mean that were a huge part of what this city was about. You can’t just sort of take 2 or 3 things that have held through the years that are the only thing that matters and say, well, if you’re not down with this all of a sudden you can’t have any sort of perspective about what it is and where it is the city is about. And that was what my main issue with the tone [in Crockett’s article] was…So you just, I understand institutionalized racism is a huge problem, but that’s an American problem. That’s not something that you need to just start blaming to people who moved to a block and decided they wanted to start cutting their lawn you know every day of the week or whatever. You know it’s misappropriating, you have to understand, not everybody comes from that background of latent sort of anger (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

Generationally, Clinton represents the changing guard of the inner-city from primarily black to a multicultural mixture of blacks, Hispanics, whites, Asians and first-generation immigrants, among others. Clinton’s divergence from the audience member’s comments as well as Crockett’s also illustrates the multiple identities within the long-term black population in the city (Pattillo, 2007). These intra-community conflicts further complicate discussions and daily negotiations of the cultural preservation of U Street/Shaw, notions of belonging, and the appropriateness of swagger-jacking.

**Class Warfare?: Money Talks on U Street**

As stated above Crockett did not attend the Busboys and Poets discussion. However, he did attend another discussion at a smaller venue later in September 2012 during which he said, “Gentrifiers, you got it, you won” (Sommer, 2012). The neighborhood’s belonging and ownership had been taken over by a new demographic that was largely based on class. The role of class in swagger-jacking as well as a sense of belonging in the neighborhood was unapologetically discussed by Sheldon:
Sheldon: Uh, I’m not going to speak to the gentrification, but when you were talking about gentrification and you said that it was the illusion or the undertone that somehow people’s race may have made them feel less welcome in the respective spots in the article and um I don’t think it’s a matter of race, I am sure it’s more of a matter of class. And I think that’s the one piece that’s essentially missing. People don’t know how to have that conversation because I think the gentrification conversation is entirely too black and white. You know, it’s a conversation built on black/poor white/rich, but what do you do when you have black/rich? And that’s part of the conversation that just has not been added [audience clapping] because the people that come in to Marvin, the people that come in to Brixton—they are black. Their money is green and their money is deep. You know? I can go right now and do an assessment and actually since the article I have been doing impromptu assessments of what my dining room looks like at certain periods of the night. And the average number I hit is anywhere from a low of 40% black to 80% black. And that’s an honest, I’m just counting the people and then people of color. And obviously, Fridays and Saturdays, outliers…and that’s a completely different issue and I blame that on Virginia and Maryland. But, you know, the weekdays, we serve a majority black population, a very strong population that would represent what the city is and what it used to be in people’s mind as a majority black city. So it’s not about how they look, it’s more about how they spend. And that is the real issue that we need to talk about because it is a class issue because I AM A GENTRIFIER [Emphasis added by author to display audible change in speaker’s tone] (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

Sheldon not only debunks the argument of institutional racism related to the neighborhood’s change, but quite dramatically emphasizes his sense of belonging and power within the neighborhood to create and bolster the current community identity as a gentrifier.

The question that naturally followed these comments was how to preserve a culture if the indigenous population is no longer present. In the interchange below an audience member, Sheldon, Clinton, and Maurice argue about the politics of cultural dispossession.

Woman: I just want to say that this is a national issue and what is the best way to preserve the culture because it just seems like with cities that black people are moving out and I don’t think that the politicians whether it’s [current Mayor Vincent] Gray in DC or Bloomberg in New York or other mayors really want to keep people of color in the city. Probably it’s race, probably it’s class, but I just want to say how do we keep the culture in the area because it seems to me that DC is becoming majority white and it just seems to me that there is no way that they are going to stop it so I am just saying how do we preserve the culture even though we are not physically in it.
**Sheldon:** I don’t know personally I feel like living in a cultural graveyard that is like a poltergeist. I feel like the ghosts will always haunt us. Um, there is a young lady who wrote an article in the *New York Times* by the name of Natalie Hopkinson and she recently wrote a book *Go-Go* and how Go-Go has essentially been pushed to the fringes of R&B and largely exists in Maryland now. That was something that started a long time ago and even Mark Barnes back in the early 2000s banned Go-Go from his spot. So that was the first major blow to Go-Go was “by a black man” right here on 14th and U because if you heard playing Go-Go you were immediately fired as a DJ. And that’s the true history of it and I’m just saying they kept on beating.

So a part of the pushing out of the culture happened…first I don’t know how we bring it back now, um, you know, I don’t know if you ever could, but I certainly, I didn’t move to this city to again live in a cultural graveyard so I hope there is a way to answer that question…because my biggest question now and I’m going to try to shut up quickly, but um, I feel that this nostalgia that came out in this piece is a double-edged sword. That we are too busy focused on what the culture was and right now no one can even temper/tell what the culture is. What are we creating now? What is our legacy going to be? Are we going to be talking about, “Hey, remember back in the day when we used to talk about back in day?”

**Clinton:** Yeah, I would agree with him. You got to have a realistic view of what the culture actually is. One of the things that obviously did bring up in that piece is that most of the people right now, a lot of people in DC support Go-Go are white private school kids in northwest. That is where they have Go-Gos every single year on masse. Just so you know. Georgetown Day, Sidwell Friends High School—they have been having Go-Go at places like that for 20 years. You got to have a realistic look before you decide how you want to hold on to it and I think he’s right. You don’t want to just live this relative thing that there are, you better respect ways people can do on top of what it is people have already done.

**Moderator:** Maurice do you have anything to say?

**Maurice:** I guess a thing; the young lady had a very important question. Chicago lost over 100,000 and this is Southside and Harlem has lost a lot of people. And so I think the problem goes a bit deeper. I think Andy is partly right and partly wrong around the question of who is responsible. Government, yes. But businesses, yes. But large businesses. DC has the largest percentage of large businesses and corporation of the in the country.
But let’s go to gentrification for a moment. And I think people get confused. Who is leaving? You are right about the “black bourgeoisie” the black bourgeoisie is not leaving Washington. The poorest people are not leaving Washington because maybe they can find a safety net even though the Director of Housing told me that 16,000 people are on the public waiting list or 15,000 a few years ago, so people are hurting. But it’s a group of people, maybe we call them working class, maybe we call them lower-working class who cannot afford the rent and to send their kids up to schools in the city and they moved to where they can. This happens all over the country. Now, are they not people of culture? Do they not want a nostalgia? A nostalgia for one to be who you are? A nostalgia for one to understand the culture of your people and to mix it up? Black people have never been some monolithic people who just like black culture, just like hip-hop. We’ve liked everything and that is what we want. The jazz, blues, hip-hop, Chuck Brown, whatever you want, but the right to be in a place where you can listen to it. So you can have a throw up nod to somebody that….so what? What about the majority of the people who cannot go…what about the majority of people in this city who are looking for jobs?…Don’t misunderstand a least bit, whom you speak about in gentrification and things like that. I am a person who wants this understanding, who wants this discussion, who wants races to get along, but I also want people who are moving in to understand they too have an obligation to a people and that is what is missing. I could care less about somebody going to Marvin and buying a bottle of $1,000 champagne. It doesn’t mean anything. What I am…

Sheldon: We ain’t got that…we don’t have that…[Audience Laughter] (Busboys and Poets, 2012).

The discussion above illustrates the basic negotiations of identity that are playing out on the streets of the neighborhood in regards to a sense of belonging. Sheldon and Clinton represent a younger group of residents, both native Washingtonians and gentrifiers, who are actively working to create spaces and places for engagement in the neighborhood—through business or community outreach. This alliance between young Washingtonians and social preserver gentrifiers is largely developed though similar education and class backgrounds and appreciation for a multicultural aesthetic and experience. For both Sheldon and Clinton, nostalgia for the neighborhood as it once was is a crutch that holds residents and the neighborhood back from progressing towards new possibilities, new growth, and a new identity. Preservation of culture is
important because a history and authenticity ground people in a place whether they originated from the area or not.

In comparison, Maurice and the audience member represent older, long-time residents who are uncomfortable with the changes they see in the community’s demographics as referenced above. For this section of the community, swagger-jacking is not a hip, new buzz word, but a representation of a larger issue of loss. This group of residents feels they have lost ownership of the neighborhood through race and class-based gentrification. The appropriation of cultural icons for the upper-class community represents the exploitation of the last form of community ownership they held—the neighborhood’s history and culture. Washington City Paper writer, Will Sommer (2012), captured the essence of cultural dispossession Maurice describes, “But swagger-jacking is more about culture than geography, about attitude and art instead of comparative wealth, and that makes it both more deliberate and more insidious.”

The intersection between policy and cultural identity was concretized in The DUKE Plan in 2005. In an attempt to be inclusive city officials drew upon the period of history identified by the community as the most important and in need of preservation. Framing the neighborhood’s redevelopment through African American art and culture seemed like a win-win for all involved. City officials achieved buy-in from existing community members, both long-term and new residents, for the plan, developers had a strong marketing ploy for their projects, and community members felt included, heard and that their identity would be appropriately remembered throughout the neighborhood. Years later, swagger-jacking identified an unforeseen effect of culturally-framed redevelopment by community members; the appropriation of cultural identity not by the city to preserve landmarks such as the Lincoln and Howard Theatres, but by

---

14 As was discussed in Chapter 5, the preservation of these landmarks also become entangled within debates over marketability, cultural consumption, preservation, and community agency.
commercial gentrifiers as a means to produce profit. Swagger-jacking may occur on a sliding scale of appropriateness from integrative recognition and reciprocity to wholesale cultural dispossession for profit. However, for many residents like Crockett, the ethics of the business owners were superfluous compared to the systemic cultural dispossession occurring throughout the neighborhood. This tension between economic growth and the equity of cultural preservation is generated directly from the effects of the implementation of culturally-framed redevelopment.

**Discussion: Swagger-Jacking and the Push-Pull of Growth and Equity in Culturally-Framed Redevelopment at the Individual Scale**

*The DUKE Plan* attempted to balance growth and equity by combining mixed-use redevelopment with cultural preservation identified as a goal through community engagement in the planning process (DCOP, 2005). The officials, developers, and residents involved did not outline their goal as a multicultural community, but a community with a wider variety of incomes that would come together to enjoy the communities cultural assets. Eight years later, that vision was realized through preservation projects as well as through businesses such as The Gibson, Busboys and Poets, and Marvin. The swagger-jacking debate characterizes a moment of both community gain and loss. The community continues to lose the population that is most tied to the culture being preserved, but continues to prosper by paying homage to that community culture through landmarks and businesses. The case of U Street/Shaw suggests that equitable approaches in planning do not always achieve equitable results.

The politics of swagger-jacking in U Street/Shaw support Brown-Saracino’s (2009) arguments that gentrification involves a multifaceted community much more complex than simple gentrifier versus old-timer conflicts. Rather, intra-community conflict exists among long-time residents in regards to the legitimacy of cultural appropriation and the changing sense of neighborhood belonging in terms of power, politics, and culture. Social preservers continue to
build their cultural and political capital in U Street/Shaw through the commodification of particular neighborhood icons. The repetition and acceptance of these icons and moments in neighborhood history subsequently determine how the culture of the neighborhood is remembered as well as authenticated. The swagger-jacking debate may have been a lightning rod within the community that was viewed as a simplified critique by some, but it represents one of the last forms of equity taken by market forces in the neighborhood. Economic growth continues to trump equity of inclusivity on the U Street corridor.

Is the creation of a multicultural, inclusive community impossible in U Street/Shaw? The Busboys and Poets’ Langston Room was filled to capacity for the community discussion in September and open to all who wanted to come. However, the only community discussion about the role of culture in gentrification had to be privately sponsored, in one of the businesses accused of swagger-jacking, no less. Moreover, the clientele of Busboys and Poets, while varied, is largely more educated as evidenced by the qualifications of the audience members who introduced themselves as college students, professors and the like. As such, it is difficult to determine if the cultural preservation occurring as a result of The DUKE Plan, swagger-jacking included, is actually achieving the heightened form of cultural understanding that can be produced through critical dialogue described in multicultural city planning theory (Innes & Booher, 2010; Sandercock, 2003; Wood & Landry, 2008).

Since the swagger-jacking debate, government officials have not engaged in the conversation of cultural dispossession as a result of redevelopment. I suggest the following practical recommendations to confront the issues that are emerging as a result of The DUKE Plans implementation include: committing to a series of widely participatory critical dialogues on the changes occurring in the community with all members of the community; revisiting The
DUKE Plan through a re-visioning or plan update planning process; bolstering affordability initiatives for working-class long-term residents who may be forced to move out of the neighborhood; supporting long-term resident-owned small businesses (other than Ben’s Chili Bowl); working with so-called swagger-jacking businesses to help find more neighborhood-based employment and service work to support business operation; offer cultural sensitivity workshops in the community. Combined, these strategies can help community members from all sects to engage in honest discussions about growth, equity, and cultural identity. Entering into a planning process to update The DUKE Plan may also help address areas of the plan where growth strategies have overrun equity policies. Currently, the city’s Office of Planning provides updates to the plan’s progress through reports, but has not held a public evaluation of the plan’s implementation.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION: THE IMPLICATIONS OF PRODUCING AUTHENTICITY

Eight years after its adoption, The DUKE Plan’s vision for U Street/Shaw’s culturally-framed redevelopment is almost completely realized. Each sub-district is in the final stages of its redevelopment or stands as an example of the power of public-private partnerships such as the Howard Theatre. The process of redevelopment confronted the politics of community and cultural ownership and economic development in the face of a recession. The level of success of the rebirth of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood is palpable. The community is featured in tourist guide books, continues to attract new residents and businesses, and bustles throughout the week and weekend as patrons of the various entertainment venues fill the streets.

The news is out—culturally-framed redevelopment works as a model for economic growth within inner cities—and people are listening. Within the city’s limits numerous other neighborhoods are undergoing similar metamorphoses. For example, H Street, NE located 21 blocks south of U Street has been marketed as another historic black business corridor and center for entertainment. New businesses along the street aptly draw from long-term resident names such as Granville Moore’s, a Belgian eatery named after the black physician that ran his practice out of the building for years (Shoenfield, et al., 2011). Redevelopment has been partnered with the construction of a streetcar line that will re-integrate the neighborhood into the city’s transit system (DCOP, 2003).

Furthermore, neighborhoods lacking place-based histories are now actively pursuing the construction of an “authentic” place brand. The NoMa neighborhood is located North of Massachusetts Avenue and east of Union Station near Capitol Hill. The area was planned beginning in the late-1990s transforming industrial properties into office, retail, residential, and hotel space (NoMa BID, 2013). The neighborhood is growing fast, but residents have
complained that the community continues to feel “sterile.” To combat this perception, NoMa’s Business Improvement District, NoMa BID, recently hired Cultural Tourism DC to begin the heritage trail planning process to chronicle and educate residents and visitors on the neighborhood’s history (Kaufman, 2013). This tactic serves not only as a means to preserve history, but to make the neighborhood more palatable and desirable to investors and new residents.

The practice of culturally-framed redevelopment is spreading throughout the city, nation and globe (Clark, 2002; Lin, 2010; Porter & Shaw, 2009; Zukin, 2010). This concluding chapter summarizes substantive findings from the analysis of growth and equity strategies and outcomes at each scale of U Street/Shaw’s redevelopment. These findings have implications for furthering the producing authenticity theoretical framework, principally in regards to cultural development, inner-city redevelopment, and gentrification. Results from this study also inform policy and practice recommendations for city officials, urban planners, developers, and community activists involved in culturally-framed redevelopment. Lastly, I describe the limitations and opportunities for further research on culturally-framed redevelopment that may improve upon sustainable and equitable development tactics.

**The Balance of Growth and Equity in Culturally-Framed Redevelopment**

The guiding research question of this study asked how issues of growth and equity are balanced throughout the culturally-framed redevelopment process at different neighborhood scales. A summation of substantive findings indicates that culturally-framed redevelopment in U Street/Shaw occurred on three different scales: neighborhood, anchor and individual. Within each scale, growth and equity strategies were combined in an effort to catalyze economic growth mediated with equitable distribution of community benefits. The framing device of the “Black
Broadway” narrative was apparent throughout the implementation of *The DUKE Plan*. This section outlines the growth and equity strategies utilized and their impacts on the neighborhood’s redevelopment.

**Growth and Equity Strategies**

In order to weave the preservation of cultural landmarks with mixed-use development, city planners and officials, developers, businesses, and nonprofits used traditional revitalization tactics partnered with preservation programs and methods. Table 7-1 below provides a breakdown of growth and equity strategies used at each scale of *The DUKE Plan*. Overall, growth strategies were drawn upon more frequently than equity strategies. As a redevelopment effort, growth strategies are necessary to synergize investment interest. Similar to many cities, Washington, DC combined public-private partnerships, infrastructure improvements, and rezonings to increase the marketability of the neighborhood. Equity strategies involved a combination of neighborhood provisions such as affordable housing, that could easily be measured, partnered with preservation programs that were immeasurable in the eyes of some community members.
Table 7-1: Growth and Equity Strategies Employed in U Street/Shaw’s Culturally-Framed Redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Growth Strategies</th>
<th>Equity Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>- Infrastructure (Metro, Street Improvements)</td>
<td>- Affordable Housing Provision (Inclusionary Zoning, Mixed-Income Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-zoning to Higher Density</td>
<td>- Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mixed-Use Redevelopment</td>
<td>- Restoration Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Place Branding</td>
<td>- Historic District Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Restoration Funds</td>
<td>- Heritage Trail Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Historic District Designation</td>
<td>- Main Streets Program (Now Defunct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Heritage Trail Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Arts Overlay Attempt (Failed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Main Streets Program (Now Defunct)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creation of Neighborhood Tourism Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anchors</strong></td>
<td>- Privatization of Publicly-Owned Properties</td>
<td>- Restoration Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tax Credits and TIFs</td>
<td>- Operational Funds (For Lincoln, Planned to End)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transfer of Power to Market Rather than Public/Community Entities</td>
<td>- Emphasis on African American Cultural Heritage and Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Position Redevelopment Adjacent to Restored Anchors</td>
<td>- Intentional Effort to Associate Programming with Neighborhood History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Employment Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Programs to Maintain Venue Attendance Affordability (Questionable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>- Increased Amenity Provision</td>
<td>- Place-Based Naming Preserves Some Sense of the Past Residents and Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Business Adoption of Place Brand</td>
<td>- Contribute to Broader Knowledge of Neighborhood History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Source, Author.*
**Neighborhood Scale.**

In the early 2000s, a significant portion of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood still displayed the negative effects of the 1968 riots. In order to redevelop the neighborhood, certain spaces simply needed to be developed. To accomplish revitalization of the community, the city made critical investments to infrastructure through the siting of two metro stops in addition to street improvements. Bringing people and businesses back to the neighborhood was encouraged through the pro-growth strategy of re-zoning to increase density, also known as up-zoning, as a means to attract mixed-use development (DCOP, 2005). The physical development of the neighborhood was augmented by the marketing and branding of the area as the historic “Black Broadway” of Washington, DC. Delivering on that place brand required investments towards the restoration and protection of significant cultural landmarks and architecture.

After the Greater U Street Historic District was established in 1998, the “Black Broadway” narrative was cemented during the Greater U Street Heritage Trail planning process that culminated in 2001 (Smith, 2008). U Street/Shaw’s place brand developed into a tourist attraction spurring the siting of a U Street Neighborhood Visitor Center in 2010 (Levey, 2010). It is important to note that cultural preservation strategies ranging from historic district designation to heritage trail development are considered as both growth and equity strategies that encourage community empowerment, but also support economic development through the marketing of the neighborhood’s history. Additional equitable strategies focused on preserving long-term residents through affordable housing provisions and community benefits agreements.

**Anchor Scale.**

In each case, both the Howard and Lincoln Theatre required pro-growth strategies to become sustainable anchors of the community. A number of pro-growth strategies were amassed for the restoration of the Howard Theatre. The financing package included TIFs and tax credits...
from the city that were integral to completing the restoration. Similarly, the Lincoln Theatre adopted a pro-growth management approach after the anchor was taken over by the city. The new operator is expected to achieve financial independence from the city and generate a sizeable profit. Major redevelopment projects were centered around anchors to realize the vision of the neighborhood as a cultural destination.

In comparison, anchor equity strategies were revised continuously in order to find new means of funding. Prior to the city’s ownership, the Lincoln Theatre relied on the city for its operational funds. Restoration funding from the city was necessary to complete the preservation of both theatres. The preservation of each theatre and dedication to providing African American live entertainment was a meaningful project for long-term community members (Shaw Library, 2010). Outreach and employment opportunities for long-term residents at the Howard Theatre also provided a benefit for some existing local residents.

**Individual Scale.**

Growth and equity strategies targeted for individual residents, businesses, and visitors provided a means to infuse the “Black Broadway” narrative as a sign of the neighborhood’s rebirth. Both long-term and new residents supported increased amenity provisions including additional police security (Card, 2012). Yet, the adoption of the place brand by new businesses was controversial among long-term residents as witnessed during the swagger-jacking debate in Chapter 6. Place-based named businesses were an equity strategy that was not outlined in *The DUKE Plan*. Rather, this appropriation of the neighborhood’s place brand concretizes the production of the neighborhood’s authentic identity to residents, visitors, and stakeholders. Recalling the process of culturally-framed redevelopment provided in Chapter 2, Figure 7-1 depicts place-based business naming as one of the final stages of this form of redevelopment.
The saturation of the place brand identity also contributes to a broader knowledge of the neighborhood’s history among residents and visitors.

Figure 7-1: The Culturally-Framed Redevelopment Process. From: Author.

**Growth and Equity Outcomes**

This section provides the findings for the research questions of the study. The implementation of U Street/Shaw’s *DUKE Plan* is an exemplar of how pro-growth and preservation strategies are intertwined throughout the culturally-framed redevelopment process. *The DUKE Plan* has successfully contributed to the revitalization of the U Street/Shaw neighborhood through a combination of growth and equity strategies. The desired outcomes of these strategies at each scale have engendered both expected and unexpected results. Historic preservation efforts were partnered with a zoning overlay that increased the number of restaurants and nightclubs along the corridor. No provisions were made within the plan that prescribed that a certain percentage of new businesses had to be owned by or employ local residents. Since 2005, U Street/Shaw has been drastically redeveloped through the construction of high-rise condos that threaten the preservation of the corridor’s vernacular culture (Carr & Servon, 2007). Along U Street, competition for tourists and economic development has thus far outweighed preservation efforts in the decisions made by the city.
In this case, the scales of growth and equity in U Street/Shaw’s culturally-framed redevelopment tip towards successful economic growth that is outpacing equity outcomes. Table 7-2 below provides an overview of these outcomes at each scale. In a cursory examination of Table 7-2, it would seem that equity outcomes outnumber growth outcomes, however, the impact of growth strategies far outweigh equity initiatives. A significant reason for this outcome is the lack of accountability measures for equity initiatives related to preservation. Growth outcomes are quantifiable and have established methodologies for measuring progress in redevelopment. Comparatively, accountability goals must be set and specifically prescribed in order to achieve measurable outcomes for qualitative actions such as cultural preservation. The inability for the city to provide accountability measures for cultural preservation continually kept the focus on economic growth as an indicator of the plan’s success.
Table 7-2: Growth and Equity Outcomes Resulting from U Street/Shaw’s Culturally-Framed Redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Growth Outcomes</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>- Increased Population</td>
<td>- Positive Heritage Trail Planning Process as Point of Neighborhood Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Property Values/Housing Prices</td>
<td>- Potential Educational Outreach Opportunities Pursued by Neighborhood Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Notoriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Tourism</td>
<td>- Defeat of Pro-Growth Arts Overlay Attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Successful Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development Outpacing Provision of Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long-term Resident Displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchors</td>
<td>- Howard Restoration Completed Through P5 Financing Package, Operational and Profitable</td>
<td>- Howard Outreach Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lincoln Poised to Become a Cultural Economic Anchor Under New Operator and Find Financial Sustainability Without City Assistance</td>
<td>- Displacement of Long-term Residents due to Coinciding and Connected Development Adjacent to the Howard Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mediated Community Participation in Lincoln Theatre Operator Application Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of Community Ownership of the Lincoln as a Social Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>- Gentrifiers and Long-Term Residents See Increased Amenities and Benefit from Increases in Property Value</td>
<td>- Loss of Neighborly Feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Number of Businesses and Services Offered at Various Price Points</td>
<td>- Marketing/Branding Targeted to Higher-Income Earning New Residents (Creative Class, Yuppies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long-Term Resident loss of Cultural Identity and Ownership/Management of that Place-Based Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Knowledge of Neighborhood Significance at Varying Degrees, Often According to Adopted “Black Broadway” Narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Source, Author.*
Neighborhood Scale.

The impacts of growth on U Street/Shaw are easy to see when you walk in the neighborhood today. The neighborhood has a steady influx of new residents. New residents are willing to pay higher housing prices to live in U Street/Shaw. At the same time, many long-term and first- or second-wave gentrifiers are pleased with the rise in their property values. The community has also become one of the neighborhoods tourists frequently visit when they come to the city (Washington, DC Economic Partnership, 2011). Visitors can go to the U Street Neighborhood Visitor Center via a tour bus that stops along the historic U Street corridor.

Equity outcomes at the neighborhood scale suggest that the community will continue to lose its long-term population. Long-term residents are continually being displaced, choosing to sell their homes or forced to move elsewhere as Section 8 housing complexes switch to market-rate apartments. Community benefits agreements (CBAs) continue to be a tool that can be used to leverage additional affordable housing provisions within new residential development projects (Juskas and Elia, 2007).

Preservation-related equity outcomes are tied to the Cultural Tourism DC heritage trails. The trail planning process provides a the potential for a moment of neighborhood unity and understanding that engenders a deeper appreciation of long-term residents and the breadth of the area’s history. Yet, the planning process is finite and the social capital ties that develop during the process are not sustainable. On-going efforts by neighborhood organizers like Tim Christensen at the LCCA to partner heritage trails with elementary school educational outreach provide opportunities for engagement that could create a more sustainable equity benefit (Christensen, 2012). Finally, the overwhelming community opposition to the Arts Overlay District discussed in Chapter 4 suggested continued resident support for preserving affordability and the neighborhood feel of U Street/Shaw.
Anchor Scale.

The restoration and management makeover at the Howard and Lincoln Theatres is still quite new, causing analysis of growth and equity outcomes to be tenuous. Both anchors have witnessed positive benefits to growth outcomes with the Howard re-opening with state-of-the-art amenities in 2012 and the Lincoln Theatre poised to re-establish itself as a cultural and economic anchor under the management of a new operator. Equity outcomes suggest that these anchors may lose their targeted audience due to displacement and social fragmentation. The redevelopment along 7th Street, NW has increased housing prices and displaced Section 8 residents. Likewise, community ownership of the Lincoln Theatre has concluded in favor of a market-oriented approach. The city and the management at each theatre (prior to the announcement of I.M.P. as Lincoln’s operator) each pledged to help the theatres serve as social anchors to the community and continue to value relationships with local organizations. So far, the Howard Theatre has commenced an oral history project and facilitated special events for long-term residents. The social outreach component of the Lincoln Theatre will depend upon the purview of I.M.P.

Individual Scale.

The individual scale of the neighborhood has changed dramatically over the past 20 years. Those owners who remained in the community through its nadir as homeowners along with first- and second-wave gentrifiers have benefited financially from pro-growth outcomes. These residents have been able to enjoy the upgraded amenities, higher property values, and an increased number of businesses that have rejuvenated the 14th and U Street corridors.

Equity outcomes at the individual scale are mixed. Some long-term residents argue that the community has lost its neighborly feel (Crockett, 2012a; Hopkinson, 2012). The feel of the neighborhood changes as more higher-income residents move to the neighborhood. The
marketing and branding of the neighborhood shifts from being a community that still holds on to its character through the retention of long-term residents and historic preservation to a community that simply honors the memory of past residents. The politics of this demographic shift are indicative of gentrification and immersed in subjective politics and ethics. Some long-term residents feel the equity outcomes are a “wolf in sheep’s clothing” meant to placate long-term residents as they lose ownership of their cultural identity and how it is presented in the neighborhood (Busboys and Poets, 2012). Others argue that at minimum, the significance of the neighborhood is being honored appropriately and that dialogue continues to increase knowledge about the neighborhood among residents and visitors (Hopkinson, 2013).

Throughout its implementation, *The DUKE Plan* failed to deliver on one critical promise—continued engagement with community members (DCOP, 2005, 42). This is not to say that the city ceased all forms of engagement with the community and its organizations. Rather, the city failed to engage residents in the on-going development and implementation of *The DUKE Plan* specifically. As such, the progression of the plan’s implementation through various development projects was viewed in a piecemeal fashion over time by community members after the plan’s adoption. Failure to continually engage residents in the comprehensive vision for the neighborhood was a missed opportunity on two accounts. First, engagement could have assured equity strategies were being fully utilized. Second, continued engagement could have provided a safeguard for cultural preservation by ensuring redevelopment remained consistent with resident desires for the preservation of the neighborhood and its history. Instead, the city continued to value pro-growth strategies and outcomes invoking equity strategies when it served their interests to maintain the “Black Broadway” place brand or to pacify critiques of the redevelopment from residents and organizers. The inability to balance growth and equity during
The DUKE Plan implementation process contributes to the understanding of stakeholder engagement politics, social preservation, and the intentional use of historic narratives in redevelopment efforts.

**Understanding Actors within the U Street/Shaw’s Redevelopment**

The U Street/Shaw case study illustrates the diverse group of stakeholders involved in culturally-framed redevelopment. At any point during the planning process a stakeholder can support growth and equity strategies and outcomes simultaneously. In most cases, this middle-of-the-road stance, that supports growth while also preserving a proportion of new development for affordable housing, has become the standard position of DC politicians and developers. The fact remains that DC politicians are often supported by development firms. This relationship has been linked to provisions of city subsidies to developers (Patel & Madden, 2013).

At the neighborhood level, business owners often hold powerful positions on institutional boards or on the ANC that place them in a position to benefit from their own decision-making processes.\(^\text{15}\) This arrangement leaves out residents, especially long-term residents. Or worse than that, it robs them of their influence. Organizations such as ONE DC, ANCs, and neighborhood organizations continue to negotiate affordable housing provision with developers through CBAs, but development continues to outpace affordability.

One solution for the city and developers to achieve their desired outcomes is to negotiate intangible benefits for community members through preservation investments. Recently, the development firm JBG agreed to replace the aging Greater U Street Heritage Trail signs as part of their CBA for a large, luxury condominium building being erected near 14\(^\text{th}\) and U Streets, NW (Pomeroy, 2012). The fact remains that Cultural Tourism DC, while providing an invaluable

\(^{15}\) Refer to Howard Theatre Restoration, Inc. board members in Chapter 5 and Sheldon Scott in Chapter 6.
service to communities, has been used by the city as a resource to soften the harsh realities of gentrification in some neighborhoods, including U Street/Shaw. The stakeholder analysis of the U Street/Shaw community reveals that there are few arenas in which residents and stakeholders interested in preserving the neighborhood’s history are able to get involved without contributing to the neighborhood’s “Black Broadway” brand.

**Social Preservation in the Culturally-Framed Redevelopment Process**

The use of culturally-framed redevelopment causes social preservation to become an integral part of the revitalization of a neighborhood. Social preservation occurs on each scale: neighborhood, anchor, and individual as a form of action and rhetoric. At the neighborhood scale, developers, city officials, and neighborhood leaders may espouse claims of social preservation to assuage critics of development as described in the previous section. For example, Roy “Chip” Ellis simultaneously managed the restoration of the Howard Theatre as a community anchor while also displacing black-owned businesses in the redevelopment of a nearby parcel into a mixed-use building (Hyra, n.d.). At the anchor scale, social preservation was used as rhetoric during the application process for a new operator for The Lincoln Theatre. While the DCCAH hoped to involve the community in their decision-making process, time limitations and lack of transparency caused many residents to feel their visions for the space to remain a social anchor were not being taken to heart (Adams, 2012; Freed, 2013b). Finally, at the individual scale, most residents, new and old, often vacillate between two extremes. On the one hand, they critique the outcomes of culturally-framed redevelopment and the need for more robust social preservation programs (e.g. affordable housing provision). On the other hand, they also enjoy the cultural consumption of the “Black Broadway” narrative (Crockett, 2012a; Hopkinson, 2012; Kim, 2012; McCall, 2010).
Use of Particular Narratives in Culturally-Framed Redevelopment

Would the redevelopment of U Street/Shaw have been as successful without the “Black Broadway” place brand? Evidence from other studies suggests that the combination of improvements to transportation, parks, housing stock, and businesses would have elicited the revival of the neighborhood as a vibrant inner-city community (Brown-Saracino, 2009; Florida, 2002; Smith, 1998). Would U Street/Shaw have looked the same, simply with a different window dressing? Perhaps, but the pull to U Street/Shaw for many residents was the attraction to an authentic identity. The “Black Broadway” era in U Street/Shaw’s history provided a narrative that emphasized the desired outcomes for the redeveloped neighborhood while also shifting perceptions of the community to a more positive light.

As described in Chapter 4, the choice of the “Black Broadway” narrative and Duke Ellington as a brand was intentional. The narrative evoked the balance between preservation and prosperity the city hoped to attain through implementation of The DUKE Plan. Today, the U Street corridor is filled with visual cues to this narrative through signage, businesses, heritage trail markers, and murals. Yes, the U Street/Shaw community would most likely have found resurgence in the early 2000s despite The DUKE Plan, but the neighborhood's overwhelming success as a tourist draw and cultural destination would not have occurred. The DUKE Plan continues to function as a strategic plan and reference for future action. The document and support it garnered from city-level stakeholders helped provide direction for community members and business leaders. In this way, the use of the “Black Broadway” narrative portrays how cities combine community revitalization and tourism in culturally-framed redevelopment.

Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to the understanding of cultural development, inner-city communities, and gentrification. In regards to the theoretical framework for producing
authenticity, the U Street/Shaw case study demonstrates how authenticity is negotiated as a result of a constant struggle between agents of preservation and commodification. Throughout the culturally-framed redevelopment process stakeholders used growth and equity strategies to develop and support the “Black Broadway” place brand as the neighborhood’s authentic identity. Over time, both critics and supporters of the redevelopment associated the neighborhood’s identity primarily with that historical era (Crockett, 2012a; McCall, 2010; Shallal, 2012).

The outcomes of culturally-framed redevelopment do not differ that greatly from past forms of inner-city renewal, but do provide innovative entry points to negotiate sustainable equitable development. Culturally-framed redevelopment stands in sharp contrast to the urban renewal programs of the 1950s and 1960s that razed entire neighborhoods. Rather than destroying neighborhoods, this form of development attempts to preserve neighborhood memories. However, similar to more recent renewal tactics, the use of cultural commodification along with targeted redevelopment can be correlated to long-term resident displacement and gentrification (Hyra, 2008). The redevelopment of U Street/Shaw was driven more by growth than social equity goals. As a result, the production of authenticity in the “Black Broadway” identity continues to contribute to displacement and neighborhood conflict (Clark, 2011; Markusen & Gadwa, 2010a). Community stakeholders and organizers dedicated to sustainable equitable development could use the historic narrative (grounded in long-term resident identity) as an entry-point for negotiating continued affordable housing and other opportunities and amenities for long-term residents.

This study also illustrates how neighborhood perceptions change and sense of belonging suffers throughout culturally-framed redevelopment. This work’s theoretical contribution on community anchors as institutions that bridge cultural, economic, and social realms describes
how sense of belonging is tied to the restoration of cultural landmarks. The politics surrounding the restoration of the Howard and Lincoln Theatres exemplified the negotiation between market-based and resident-based desires for the programming and purpose of both spaces. In addition, the swagger-jagging debate in Chapter 6 showcases how culturally-framed redevelopment, when not accompanied by on-going community engagement, may cause long-term residents to feel a loss of belonging and ownership of their neighborhood and identity.

The politics and power relations that drive this form of development were a prominent concern of this work. The stakeholders involved in *The DUKE Plan*’s implementation included city officials, developers, and neighborhood residents. Thus, culturally-framed redevelopment bridges the gap between city-led redevelopment, market-led investments, and resident-led social preservation efforts (Clark, 2011; Hyra, 2008; Brown-Saracino, 2009). In U Street/Shaw, city and developer stakeholders drove the vision and implementation of the redevelopment effort, providing some equity initiatives for residents when required or successfully petitioned for by grassroots organizations and residents. In her work on gentrifying communities, Brown-Saracino (2009) found that some gentrifiers became involved in social preservation efforts to maintain the authenticity of their neighborhoods. Leadership in U Street/Shaw is involved in social preservation along with amenity provisions allocated through CBA negotiations with developers, but affordability continues to be an issue within the community. This study complicates Brown-Saracino’s (2009) concept of social preservers as this group of gentrifiers become both agents for preserving authenticity and consumers of the neighborhood’s place brand. Strong leadership is needed to partner with organizing groups like ONE DC to continue the fight for long-term residents to have a right to stay in the neighborhood.
The findings from this study suggest that culturally-framed redevelopment, while providing some equity initiatives, remains a pro-growth development intervention. The inability for equity initiatives to become a more prominent goal of development may be due to the difficulty in determining how to measure the success of equity strategies. Affordable housing remains one of the only attributes consistently called upon to measure the balance of growth and equity within inner-city redevelopment. City leaders will support social preservation based upon the economic and political climate within their constituent neighborhoods. Robust grassroots support and definition of accountability measures for equity goals are necessary to gain a critical mass of social preservation programs. Social preservation programs could include the establishment of a heritage fund where a portion of money spent at cultural landmarks and on heritage tourism placed in a fund supports local, long-term arts and heritage organizations. Other preservation programs could include the establishment of a street festival for long-term and past residents, discounts for low-income community members at entertainment venues, social outreach programs at cultural landmarks, educational outreach programs that partner with heritage trails, inclusion of oral history exhibitions at landmarks and visitor centers, employment of long-term residents at cultural landmarks and destinations, and creating a community-determined priority list for preservation projects, to name a few.

**Contributions for Planning Practice and Policy**

Urban planners are public servants, many of whom enter into the profession with the hopes to simply improve quality of life for residents. Often times, planners assume multiple roles in the community ranging from the neighborhood mediator, psychologist, social worker, educator, and primary point of access to city government. The lessons learned from culturally-framed redevelopment in U Street/Shaw provide practicing planners with an overview of the
variety of issues one may find in their neighborhoods if a similar project is attempted. In addition, the outcomes of redevelopment in U Street/Shaw have implications for planning practice and policy in terms of community engagement, stakeholder partnerships, community anchor support, and tactics for working in communities undergoing gentrification.

The city’s Office of Planning failed to continue community engagement after The DUKE Plan was adopted. Engagement not only keeps residents abreast of changes in their neighborhood, but provides an opportunity for residents to feel acknowledged and empowered (Sarkissian et al., 2010). Resident knowledges should also be incorporated into the various facets of culturally-framed redevelopment. Throughout the redevelopment process oral histories were drawn upon to support the “Black Broadway” narrative, but the other resident assets and skills that may have existed within the community and could have furthered equity initiatives were not tapped. City officials, planners, and developers sometimes feel that resident engagement can slow down the development process. For example, in 2008, many residents were unhappy with the statue designated to be installed near the Howard Theatre in Ellington Plaza because it was not the work of a local resident (Abbas, 2008). Rather than employing a local artist, DCCAH could have engaged the community in deciding what aspects of the neighborhood’s heritage the statue could have featured. In doing so, the community could remain engaged in the planning process, feel empowered, and have a direct hand in the look and feel of redeveloped spaces.

The Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office, DCCAH and other city entities engaged in the implementation of The DUKE Plan could increase resident engagement by broadening the Cultural Tourism DC heritage trail planning process. The city’s tourism arm, Destination DC, is already closely tied with the non-profit organization. Rather than having community heritage trail working groups disband after the trail is completed, the city’s
neighborhood planners could continue to engage this core group of stakeholders in the redevelopment process. Keeping this group engaged provides a touchstone to residents who are keenly aware of the neighborhood’s entire history, chosen narrative brand, and repercussions of redevelopment. As such, they may have inventive insights for social preservation and equity strategies.

Further, there is a moral and ethical undertone within culturally-framed redevelopment that problematizes the displacement of the long-term residents who are the subjects of the neighborhood’s place brand. First and foremost, stakeholders must create place-based accountability measures to assure that residents who are integral to the neighborhood’s place brand are able to benefit from investment. Measures could include the implementation of surveys and on-going public dialogues about the implementation of place branding as was suggested, but not implemented in The DUKE Plan. Additional accountability measures could include the employment of a predetermined number of long-term residents at landmarks and venues that feature their cultural heritage as well as discounts to attend heritage events to promote the continued education of cultural identity to the next generation (as described above). Cities also should institute strict regulations for helping long-term residents maintain the right to live in the neighborhood through appropriate affordable housing provisions and inclusionary zoning. For example, Progression Place’s affordable housing provision for those who make 60 to 80 percent of the area median income (AMI) is simply not sufficient to serve the needs of low-income residents (Neibauer, 2012a). Cities must work through a combination of public and private resources to maintain housing affordability.

Community ownership should also be supported in the operation of community anchors. Neighborhood planners and stakeholders should consistently interact and work with community
anchor institutions throughout the redevelopment process. For instance, despite its economic failures, the Lincoln Theatre is still a social anchor in the community (for now). The city via DCCAH could work with the new operator of the Lincoln Theatre to create a community arts consortium that regularly meets and puts on events at the venue. Connecting anchors to neighborhood organizations through programming encourages and maintains community ownership of cultural landmarks.

Finally, cities should carefully vet and choose appropriate partners in the form of developers, non-profit organizations, and community groups during the planning and implementation of culturally-framed redevelopment. City officials should develop a nuanced understanding for addressing growth and equity concerns in their constituencies. For example, as a city official, Jim Graham appropriately opposed the arts overlay attempt when he saw that neighborhood residents were wary of the effect the overlay could have on affordability. In addition, neighborhood actors including organizations and local government bodies should work to re-establish positive relationships with former community anchors. One untapped partner within the U Street/Shaw neighborhood are the community churches. Earlier, this work touched upon the recent lack of community engagement exhibited by local churches. Working with these key institutions, planners could help re-instate the legitimacy of churches as key community stakeholders. These institutions could help mitigate the negative impacts of place branding and gentrification by re-uniting past residents with current long-term and new residents, working together to create a new community vision for social preservation.

Limitations and Future Research

As with any study, there are limitations within this research design and approach that provide opportunities for future research. The limits of this study include its single case study
approach, representative sample, and lack of econometric data measures. These limitations warrant further research through multiple case study analysis of other communities, quantitative analysis on the impacts of culturally-framed redevelopment, and a deeper level of engagement with displaced residents.

This study was completed as a single case study of the U Street/Shaw community. As a case study, U Street/Shaw is significant as the first community to undergo culturally-framed redevelopment in Washington, DC. Thus, the findings from this study are limited by the context in which the redevelopment efforts occurred within the neighborhood. Future research is needed to investigate similar communities to examine the balance of growth and equity strategies and outcomes in a different context. Additional case studies such as the H Street, NE neighborhood may provide important findings for how to improve equitable development and possibly evaluate the impact of strategies to balance growth and equity.

I attempted to interact with all major social groups during my four years as an active participant researcher within the community. Yet, due to the changing demographics within the neighborhood the majority of people with whom I engaged or interviewed were gentrifiers (of various waves). Additional research could be conducted to chronicle the process of culturally-framed redevelopment from the perspective of long-term residents in more detail. For example, a study on the neighborhood’s real estate data could provide more detailed analysis on ingress and egress patterns within the community. Moreover, a study of the redevelopment process from the perspective of displaced residents or those who chose to move out of the neighborhood may provide meaningful results on how social and cultural preservation impacts the social group highlighted by a neighborhood’s place brand.
Lastly, this study relies largely on qualitative data from years of participant observation and interviews with community members. The findings from this work could be partnered with a quantitative analysis of the economic impact of place brand-related businesses to critically examine the effect the cultural frame of “Black Broadway” had on the neighborhood’s economy. A study of this nature may find that place brand narratives do in fact have measurable positive impacts on a community’s economy. This finding would support the concept of the production of authenticity as a theoretical framework and point of critical dialogue for communities considering this form of redevelopment. Moreover, a quantitative analysis of employment data, economic base analysis, and demographic data could provide meaningful findings towards the development of accountability measures that can be instituted to assure more equitable outcomes in culturally-framed redevelopment.

**Final Thoughts**

On my first fieldsite visit to the neighborhood, I stood outside the Reeves Center under a blanket of grey clouds and mist of drizzling rain. I waited anxiously by the heritage trail sign at the corner of 14th and U Streets for a passerby to stop and read the sign so that I could ask them what they knew about the neighborhood?, Why did they stop?, What did they think of the sign’s message about the neighborhood’s history? Over the period of four hours only two people stopped at the sign—a couple looking at the sign’s street map in hopes of finding a Lululemon store. I left the neighborhood defeated, wondering if the heritage trail had any impact at all on how residents and visitors contextualized their experience within the community. Since then I have had the pleasure of engaging with residents and community stakeholders who are dedicated to preserving the area’s history for current and future residents. These residents reflect the activism and passion that is required to realize sustainable equitable development.
At the same time, I have witnessed the neighborhood’s vernacular aesthetic change dramatically over the few years that I have been active within the community: theatres have been restored, buildings have been torn down, luxury condos are under construction, and construction cranes litter the skyline. One of the positive outcomes hoped by the community to arise out of the heritage trail and redevelopment process was the engagement of residents with the neighborhood’s historic black past. The consequences of these efforts have been met with mixed feelings by residents according to Natalie Hopkinson (2013):

Natalie: I have a friend who worked on the community neighborhood tours. When she started doing them they [residents] saw Cultural Tourism DC as a gentrification organization where whites would come in and look at houses…they had to work hard to dispel that…its important work they are doing.

Those markers that they put up. People look at them as tombstones…for the black people that lived here…but it’s just necessary…people need to know….They [residents, CTDC, the city, anchors] are focused on history, but we are a living history as a community and there are still black people here! I wish people would stop and talk to the grandma sitting on the porch because she could tell you so much more than what’s on the tour! If we could just support that interaction as valuable it might change a lot [of things in terms of how new and old residents, tourist and visitors interact].

Natalie’s sentiments reveal one of the significant unintended consequences of culturally-framed redevelopment—impacts on sociality and conviviality in the daily life of residents. By retaining an unwavering focus on merely honoring the past, culturally-framed redevelopment separates preservation from social engagement. Residents and visitors become consumers of history rather than actively engaging with the history that surrounds them in the form of neighbors and acquaintances. By not talking to “the grandma sitting on the porch” social preservers and other residents do not benefit from the social nature of learning, developing mutual understanding, and community building.
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APPENDIX A
METHODS

My research approach included a single-case study ethnographic research design that employed Michael Burawoy’s (1998) “extended case method” to understand the relationship between the U Street/Shaw neighborhood as a micro-environment and the macro-variables of city and federal governance, economic development trends and globalized economy. The sections below outline the research design employed to generate meaningful, conclusive data that could contribute to the existing literature on the impacts of cultural commodification and preservation within inner cities. First, the research design is discussed followed by a description of data sources, data analysis techniques, researcher bias, study validity and limitations.

U Street/Shaw as a Single-Case Study and a Combined Inductive-Deductive Approach

Case study research is defined by Yin (2009) as a method of empirical inquiry that examines contemporary phenomenon within its natural context, particularly in cases where the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are unclear. As such, the researcher has little control over the research environment. Case study research questions should be “how” or “why” questions that attempt to describe, explain, or explore a particular phenomenon. There are four general types of case studies: those that attempt to explain links in real-life situations, studies that aim to describe a phenomenon and its context, studies that illustrate phenomenon through evaluation, and those that evaluate interventions for the purpose of enlightening their intended audience on possible outcomes. For example, Brown-Saracino (2009) uses multiple case studies of towns and neighborhoods undergoing gentrification in an attempt to describe how residents (old and new) interact with one another in their changing environment. Brown-Saracino (2009) had no direct control over her research sites, nor is there a clear boundary between the cause and relationship between gentrification and particular webs of social interaction. Case study research
design includes the components of: questions (how or why), propositions, unit of analysis, logic linking data to propositions (pattern matching, cross-case synthesis), and criteria for interpreting findings (establishing credibility, validity measures).

Single case study research centers on addressing a “how” or “why” question about one particular case. For my study the research question centered on how culturally-framed redevelopment balanced growth and equity. This research question is centered on a particular case that is unique by focusing on a particular moment in time in a particular place. As a single case study, the U Street/Shaw neighborhood serves as a typical case of how Washington, DC’s current model of redevelopment couples new commercial development with cultural preservation and heritage tourism.

Single case study research questions are bounded by the nature of the research site and context. In his analysis of Villa Victoria in Boston, Small (2004) aimed to describe some of the conditions under which neighborhood poverty lessened social capital. While Small (2004) used theory to develop his research question, his findings were inextricably linked to the conditional factors that structured his particular research site. Single case study research questions may be generalized including, “How does neighborhood branding and arts investments change the perception of a neighborhood?” Wherry (2011) frames his case study of a Latino neighborhood in Philadelphia through this research question. In essence, single case study research questions focus on understanding the outcomes and factors related to a specific phenomenon that are often bounded in the context of a particular site. As a result, some ethnographic, single case studies adopt an inductive approach.

My research design combined Burawoy’s (1998) deductive approach with traditional ethnographic inductive research methods. Burawoy’s (1998) extended case method is a
deductive approach informing where a hypothesis guides a study. The ethnographer enters the field with theoretical knowledge and a particular problem or issue in mind to study. This theoretical problem drives their investigation, data collection, and analysis. In analysis, the deductive ethnographer attempts to reconstruct existing theory based on their newfound knowledge rather than generate a new theory. The extended case method outlines a means to situate daily life and events within the context of macro- (external) and historical forces. The extended case method is an example of a “reflexive science” which embraces engagement and participant observation as the primary method to develop critical understandings of social processes. The extended case method achieves objectivity and validity through interventions (interviews), process (aggregation of situational known process), structuration (linking the site to external effects), and theory reconstruction. In U Street/Shaw, I engaged in participant observation, conducting various field methods that allowed me to identify and trace sources of differences that lead to the effects of external forces. Thus, the extended case method provided a means to reconstruct theory through a multi-scalar analysis.

While largely drawing upon the extended case method, I also utilized an inductive approach to develop the findings and theories related to each scale investigated as part of the U Street/Shaw study (neighborhood[s], anchor, individual). Inductive research is a theory-building research orientation where simple observation is used to generate theory. An example of inductive research is grounded theory. Charmaz (2006) outlines the 6 major characteristics of grounded theory as: simultaneous data collection and analysis, codes developed from data (not hypothesis), middle range theories used to explain behavior, memo making, theoretical sampling, and delay of literature review. Throughout my research I utilized each of these characteristics to understand how authenticity was produced and negotiated at each scale within the
neighborhood’s redevelopment. The findings from this inductive approach were then partnered with the on-going exploration and hypothesis that connected U Street/Shaw’s redevelopment to the rest of the city, nation, and globe. By understanding the micro-environment of U Street/Shaw and its embedded scales inductively, I was able to draw meaningful conclusions that related to my hypothesis that culturally-framed redevelopment results in economic growth and questionable results in terms of equity and benefits for long-term community members.

Single case studies provide meaningful findings that can be applied to cases that have similar characteristics. Thus, they present a limited opportunity for generalization. At the same time, single case studies provide powerful descriptive claims to understanding particular sites of inquiry. Single case studies cannot claim to have a far reaching implications for the complex issues that plague the current global context. To do so requires stretching the goals of qualitative and ethnographic research to include more sites and less emphasis on detail-oriented descriptions. As such, one limitation of the U Street/Shaw case study is that its findings are also limited based on its context. Additional case studies of other neighborhoods confronting similar development forces within Washington, DC can be compiled with this study to provide broader generalizability and should be pursued. Finally, the prevalence of cases similar to U Street/Shaw in the literature suggest that while this single-case study is limited, it does provide a meaningful contribution to the dynamics and politics of placemaking in this form of redevelopment.

**Data Sources**

My study utilized multiple data sources to triangulate emerging patterns related to culturally-framed development. Triangulation refers to the combination of methodologies when studying one phenomenon as a means to strengthen the findings of the study (Patton, 2001). This section outlines the different data sources used to analyze how growth and equity are balanced in
the case study community. At the conclusion of this section, Table A-1 illustrates how each data source is drawn upon to answer each of the three research questions along with my associated level of participation.

**Participant Observation**

A principal data source in ethnographic studies is participant observation in which the researcher observes and participates in community life through daily interactions with community members and attending local community meetings. Emerson (2001) notes the goal of participant observation is to be at the center and at the margins simultaneously. Striking such a delicate balance involves various levels of engagement and distancing to maintain objectivity during a project. Participant observation in the U Street/Shaw community occurred on a weekly or monthly basis since the spring of 2010. I attended monthly ANC meetings, civic association meetings, and related local meetings to understand the concerns and current goals within the neighborhood. In addition, I attended heritage trail tours and other cultural events to chronicle how the narrative of the neighborhood was presented to the public.

Participation in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood at monthly meetings helped me gain entry into the community and build trust. Through regular interactions at U Street/Shaw community events, social gatherings, and interviews with various community members I established my position within the community as a researcher as well as ties with informants involved in culturally-framed development.

During participant observation I recorded jottings in my field notebook to recall interactions and events that relate to the study. After returning from the field I wrote fieldnotes describing observations and events. Fieldnotes included thick descriptions of actors at each research site, dynamics between actors, and major events related to the research. Three types of fieldnotes were written on a daily basis: descriptive fieldnotes that recorded daily events,
theoretical notes that related to understanding the phenomenon, and methodological notes that outlined failures, successes and suggestions for field methods or data sources (Schatzman & Strauss, 1976). Analytical memos were regularly written during the participant observation phase of research to build and establish emerging patterns and categories (Emerson et al., 1995).

**Interviews**

Interviews provide a means to understand participants in their own words, thoughts, and perceptions (Weiss, 1994). During my period of participant observation in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood I collected over 30 interviews with community stakeholders, residents, and visitors, formally and informally. Formal interviews represented a sample of the current demographics of the neighborhood. As such, the majority of interviews occurred with various waves of gentrifiers. It was difficult to secure interviews with long-term residents of the African American community due to the fact that this population is now a minority group within the neighborhood. Public meetings that featured these key stakeholders were able to help augment the lower number of interviews from this demographic group.

Interviews were each roughly one hour in length and were guided by an interview protocol (See Appendix C). All questions were open-ended to encourage the informant to comprehensively answer queries. I also used prodding techniques through extending silences, filling in the details of respondent answers, asking clarifying questions, and asking how the respondent perceives particular events or reactions to encourage the respondent to speak. During interviews I was sensitive to uncomfortable topics and issues of confidentiality of information.

Interviews provide a way to elicit detailed descriptions, differing perspectives, and comprehensive understandings of activities and events that would not have been possible through general participant observation and fieldnotes. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed for data analysis.
I used multiple precautions to protect the rights of the participants. The study was approved by the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board. All formal interviewees reviewed and signed research consent forms (See Appendix C). Some participants chose to use a pseudonym. Participants were given the option to drop out of the study at any time at which would result in the destruction of their interview and its associated transcript.

**Content Analysis**

Content analysis of past meeting minutes of organizations, newspaper accounts, blog articles, court documents, and other formal studies provide meaningful data from which an ethnographer can compare their emerging findings (Emerson et al., 1995). City plans for each research site, archival documents, and media accounts of events in each neighborhood through blogs and newspapers were analyzed. Gaining insight into the content, features, and themes of these documents provided additional data that was used to triangulate emerging patterns related to each of the three sub-questions.

**Secondary Data**

This study combined secondary data about demographic and economic characteristics in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood in addition to primary data gathered through interviews and participant observation. This set of data was used to identify how the neighborhood changed over time and the impact on development on the neighborhood. Secondary data from the U.S. Census between 1970 and 2010, the American Community Survey, and data collected by city government and research institutions were combined to establish the connection between culturally-framed redevelopment and neighborhood change. The relationship between each data source and research question is illustrated below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Archival Records</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Actors in Planning Process, Politics of Development</td>
<td>Neighborhood Planners, ANC Representatives, City Officials, Preservationists, Business Owners, Developers, Community Group Leaders, Residents</td>
<td>Attend ANC and Civic Association Meetings; Cultural Planning Meetings and Related Events</td>
<td>Newspaper Accounts, Media Archives (e.g. blogs, television, radio),</td>
<td>City Plans, Prior Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Social Preservation Efforts</td>
<td>Upper-, middle-Income Individuals (new and long-time residents and business owners across racial groups)</td>
<td>Attend ANC and Civic Association Meetings and Related Events</td>
<td>Census 1970-2010, HMDA 1999-2008, Data Sites such as Neighborhood Info DC.</td>
<td>City Plans, Newspaper Accounts, Media Archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Narrative Choice</td>
<td>Preservationists, Cultural Tourism DC Staff, City Officials, Neighborhood Planners, Business Owners, Residents</td>
<td>Attend Cultural Tourism DC community meetings and staff meetings as well as neighborhood meetings.</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment</td>
<td>City Plans, Washington Historical Society Archives, Washingtonian Collection at the MLK Library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Source, Author.*
Data Analysis Techniques

Ethnographic analysis involves an iterative process of identifying major themes, codes, and patterns that exist amongst the various forms of data collected. Data analysis of all sources was collected and grouped along the three primary categories of Actors and the Politics of the Development Process, Social Preservation Efforts, and Narrative Choice relating to the three sub-questions outlined in Chapter 1. Combined, these categories contributed to a broader understanding of how growth and equity is balanced during culturally-framed development.

Coding and Memoing Procedures

Transcribed interviews, observations written up as fieldnotes, and content analysis documents underwent a repetitive coding and memoing procedure. Coding is the process of sorting data into various categories or topics that are meaningful to a particular framework that has been widely used by ethnographers in all social sciences (e.g. hypothesis, theory, established categories, Emerson et al., 1995). Interviews, fieldnotes, and documents were coded in two phases. Before coding, I read through my data to achieve a general understanding of my collected material (Watson & Till, 2009)

First, I completed open coding during which I read data sources line by line to outline all possible analytic themes (Emerson et al., 1995). After open coding certain themes were selected as most pertinent including anchors, neighborhood brands, and resident perceptions to name a few. Due to the fact that my research approach was inductive and deductive, I began coding along the established categories outlined above as well as other categories that emerged overtime (e.g. swagger-jacking). Afterwards I critically analyzed how the code categories related to the larger themes of my research question (e.g. growth, equity, gentrification, cultural development). After open coding was completed, I commenced focused coding including a line by line analysis
based on the selected themes and linkages. Coded categories were divided into notebooks and files.

The codes and patterns that exist within each research site were compared with one another during the final stages of research to establish comparisons between scales of the redevelopment effort (e.g. neighborhood, anchor, individual). Through this process divergence and convergence patterns were assessed (Yin, 2009). This process helped legitimize generalizations.

During coding I also completed various memos that aided in the analysis process. Theoretical memos were used during open coding and to document early theoretical interpretations of the phenomenon. However, the goal of coding and memoing is the construction of integrative memos that occur as the researcher develops an understanding of the relationship between codes that refine analytical themes and link data sources to theory and theory reconstructions (Emerson et al., 1995). These written accounts served as the in-between step that occurs between coding and writing the analysis of the study. The iterative nature of and triangulation of data sources that framed my coding and memoing procedure provided a comprehensive qualitative method to analyze the production of authenticity in each neighborhood.

**Triangulation**

General findings from secondary data were combined with the patterns that emerged during the coding and memoing procedure to produce a comprehensive account of culturally-framed redevelopment in U Street/Shaw. As previously stated, drawing from multiple data sources during data collection and analysis helped maintain the objectivity and inclusiveness of the study. Secondary data was used to compare the demographic changes within the neighborhood over time that displayed characteristics of gentrification during the implementation.
of culturally-framed development. Thus, these measures serve as objective forms of data compared to the ethnographic data that inherently exhibit a certain amount of bias.

**Research Bias**

Participant observation requires time and long-term engagement with a community. It is natural that over an extended period of time immersed in a community that the researcher will develop certain biases in regards to their participants. At the same time, the researcher does not enter the site *tabula rasa*, but with personal histories and experiences that inform their perception of the world and its dynamics. Combined, these two forms of bias affect how I, as a researcher approached, observed, recorded, and analyzed my work (Emerson, et al, 2005).

My personal background affects how I analyzed my data and conducted research. I recognize that my research will never be perfectly objective. I am a white, 28 year old, married student. In addition, I was noticeably pregnant during a significant portion of my field research. These characteristics affected not only how I viewed participants at my research site, but also how they viewed my presence. I have studied African American communities for the past six years and am sensitive to how my background may frame how people view me in their neighborhood, my position in their neighborhood, and how I view interactions with members of the neighborhood. My past research with other communities related to heritage efforts allowed me to achieve buy-in with key informants as a means to gain entry into the neighborhood. While I did not live in the U Street/Shaw neighborhood, I lived in close residential proximity to the neighborhood which allowed me easy access to U Street/Shaw on a daily and weekly basis.

I made various efforts to maintain as much objectivity as possible during this study. I kept a personal journal outside of fieldnotes to consistently separate emotions and personal feelings from observations. Fieldnotes were written shortly after returning from the field to
assure as must objectivity as possible. In addition, I constantly compared my case to other relevant cases in the literature to evaluate my observations and analysis (Emerson, 2001). Finally, I remained committed to the ethics associated with the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board to assure that my research was conducted in a sensitive manner respectful of all participants.

**Study Validity**

The credibility of an ethnographic account is largely dependent upon the skills of the researcher and the methods used during data collection. Throughout my research I continually conducted design checks during fieldwork by considering rival methodological and theoretical hypotheses to assure I was maintaining valid design practices (Patton, 2001; Yin, 2009). The validity of this study was determined by analyzing the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the study as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Credibility techniques I used included participant observation over a significant amount of time and triangulation of data sources. Transferability was accomplished through thick description in fieldnotes and the dissertation write-up that allowed comparison between scales. Dependability was established through overlapping methods including content analysis, participant observation, and interviews. Finally, confirmability was exhibited through triangulation and reflexive journaling that separated my inner thoughts from my fieldnotes.

I also tested the validity of my research by asking community members, chiefly key informants, in each research site to review portions of my dissertation or validate the arguments I was putting forth in my dissertation in a critical dialogue. Intersubjectivity was accomplished as individuals agreed with particular descriptions of events and/or findings. Approval of the findings of the study through host verification also confirmed the validity of the study.
Limitations

Limitations are apparent in this study even with the measures taken to maintain objectivity and assure validity. First, given the nature of ethnographic research I found that certain aspects of my research questions and categories did not fit the dynamics occurring in each neighborhood causing me to change my research design. For example, I initially intended to complete a multi-sited case study design incorporating other Washington, DC neighborhoods to serve as comparisons to U Street/Shaw. However, time limitations caused my design to shift to a single-case study design. Second, the single-case study design and unique attributes of Washington, DC presented some limitations to the generalizability of my findings. Washington, DC is a distinctive city in terms of its governance structure and economic base which may cause certain findings to be difficult to compare to other cases across the United States or the globe. In the face of these limitations, my combined inductive and deductive ethnographic approach allows the flexibility to apply appropriate data collection and analysis tools as well as theoretical concepts to this study. My dedication to replicability across themes and categories assured generalizability among neighborhoods with similar demographic and institutional characteristics.
# APPENDIX B

## U STREET/SHAW AND WASHINGTON, DC DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

**Table B-1. U Street/Shaw Racial Demographics, 1970-2010.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th># Black</th>
<th># White</th>
<th># Other</th>
<th># Hispanic</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Other</th>
<th>% Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>40,928</td>
<td>35,409</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>86.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>28,723</td>
<td>23,202</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>80.78</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>29,567</td>
<td>20,373</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29,741</td>
<td>16,485</td>
<td>9,273</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>5,009</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>55.43</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>16.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>34,750</td>
<td>10,604</td>
<td>18,372</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>52.87</td>
<td>30.52</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>13.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Table B-2. Washington, DC Racial Demographics, 1970-2010.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Number Black</th>
<th>Number White</th>
<th>Number Other</th>
<th>Number Hispanic</th>
<th>Percent White</th>
<th>Percent Black</th>
<th>Percent Other</th>
<th>Percent Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>756,379</td>
<td>537,510</td>
<td>210,930</td>
<td>7,939</td>
<td>15,672</td>
<td>27.89%</td>
<td>71.06%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>638,328</td>
<td>448,370</td>
<td>174,705</td>
<td>15,253</td>
<td>17,777</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>70.24%</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>606,900</td>
<td>399,751</td>
<td>179,689</td>
<td>27,460</td>
<td>31,359</td>
<td>29.61%</td>
<td>65.87%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>572,059</td>
<td>350,829</td>
<td>179,910</td>
<td>41,320</td>
<td>45,015</td>
<td>31.45%</td>
<td>61.33%</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>601,723</td>
<td>305,125</td>
<td>231,471</td>
<td>65,127</td>
<td>54,749</td>
<td>38.47%</td>
<td>50.71%</td>
<td>10.82%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>40,928</td>
<td>28,723</td>
<td>29,567</td>
<td>29,741</td>
<td>34,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>756,379</td>
<td>638,328</td>
<td>606,900</td>
<td>572,059</td>
<td>601,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005-09 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Street/Shaw</td>
<td>$48,265</td>
<td>$62,567</td>
<td>$68,452</td>
<td>$101,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$77,355</td>
<td>$93,288</td>
<td>$102,342</td>
<td>$115016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From, NeighborhoodInfo DC, 2012.

Table B-5. Percentage of Population with a BA or Higher at U Street/Shaw and Washington, DC Levels, 1990-2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Street/Shaw</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table B-6. U Street/Shaw Housing Occupation Data, 1970-2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Owner Occupied</th>
<th>% Renter Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>14,302</td>
<td>15,963</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>12,451</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>13,185</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>10,638</td>
<td>14,492</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>12,515</td>
<td>19,179</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Owner Occupied</th>
<th>% Renter Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>79,036</td>
<td>183,502</td>
<td>262,538</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>89,830</td>
<td>163,313</td>
<td>253,143</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>97,085</td>
<td>152,549</td>
<td>249,634</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>101,216</td>
<td>147,122</td>
<td>248,338</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>112,005</td>
<td>154,652</td>
<td>266,657</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table B-8. Percentage of Owner-Occupied Units at U Street/Shaw and Washington, DC Levels, 1990-2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>% Change 1990-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>138.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Street/Shaw Washington, DC</td>
<td>$72,662</td>
<td>$82,151</td>
<td>$85,510</td>
<td>$96,968</td>
<td>$94,826</td>
<td>$107,678</td>
<td>$122,942</td>
<td>$119,233</td>
<td>$128,555</td>
<td>$131,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* From, NeighborhoodInfo DC, 2012.
Table B-10. Average Number of Home Sales for U Street/Shaw and Washington, DC Census Tracts, 1995-2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U Street/Shaw</th>
<th>Average for all Washington, DC Census Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From, NeighborhoodInfo DC, 2012.*
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW CONSENT AND PROTOCOL FORMS APPROVED BY THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Informed Consent
U Street Cultural Heritage Case Study

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:
As a graduate student researcher at Virginia Tech, I, Allison Heck, state the purpose of this study is to examine the efforts of community and cultural development along the U Street corridor to understand neighborhood relationships and how cultural development may be contributing to neighborhood change and creating community identity as well as the extent of community empowerment accomplished through such development efforts.

What you will be asked to do in the study:
If you agree to participate in the study, you will be asked to provide your perspective of development and cultural initiatives along the U Street corridor and surrounding neighborhood in the form of an approximately one hour interview. The list of general question topics include: how cultural heritage investments are related to the area’s development, your knowledge of past and current U Street area development projects, present neighborhood issues along U Street, and your opinions on how the neighborhood’s identity has changed over time. Your interview will be conducted by phone or at your office or home after I have received a copy of this signed consent from you. With your permission, I would like to audiotape this interview. Only I will have access to the tape, which I will personally transcribe. All tapes will be destroyed by being erased at the conclusion of the research. Your verbal remarks may be included in the final document. If this is agreeable to you, please sign the consent form below where indicated.

Risks and Benefits:
There are no anticipated risks, compensation, or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this interview. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the study at any time without consequence.

Compensation:
There will be no direct compensation for participation in this study.

Confidentiality:
Your identity will be associated with your interview or comments in meetings unless you specifically request that I do not include your name in the final document. You may choose a pseudonym to go by if you prefer to remain anonymous.

Voluntary participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

**Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:**

Allison Heck Graduate Student, Virginia Tech, Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, 1021 Prince Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. Email: ajaheck@vt.edu.

**Agreement:**

I have read the procedures described above and agree to participate in the interview for the U Street Cultural Heritage Case Study. I agree to have my remarks included and identified as mine in the final document.

Participant: ___________________ Date: _________________

Co-Investigator: ___________________ Date: _________________

I have read the procedures described above and agree to participate in the interview for the U Street Cultural Heritage Case Study. I do not wish to have my remarks identified in relation to my real name in the final document but rather wish them to remain confidential and have a pseudonym, subject to the protections described above and confidential to the extent provided by law.

Participant: ___________________ Date: _________________

Co-Investigator: ___________________ Date: _________________

**Copy of Interview**

If you wish to receive a copy of the final product, please indicate here and provide your name and address below. I will be happy to provide you a copy with the thesis upon its completion.

YES / NO (Circle one)

Participants Mailing Address:
Interview Questions
U Street Cultural Heritage Case Study

Participants will be able to answer these open-ended questions and have the choice to refuse to answer questions at any time or drop out of the study and have the materials associated with their participation destroyed.

1.) How do you feel cultural heritage investments are related to the area’s development?

2.) What is your knowledge of past and current U Street area development projects?

3.) What do you think are the main neighborhood issues along U Street?

4.) What are your opinions on how the neighborhood’s identity has changed over time?

5.) How long have you lived in the U Street area?

6.) What attracted you to the area?

7.) Are you or someone you know involved with any cultural initiatives?

8.) What, if any support or barriers have you confronted in regards to cultural initiatives?

9.) What do you feel is the area’s identity?

10.) How is history important to the area's identity?

11.) How do you feel the area's brand and marketing is related to the area’s identity?

12.) Has increased tourism along the U Street corridor changed the neighborhood?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Month/Year of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moshe Adams</td>
<td>Director of Grants, DCCAH</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sondra Arkin</td>
<td>Neighborhood Artist, President of Mid-City Artists</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ben’s Chili Bowl Staff</td>
<td>Staff at U Street Neighborhood Visitor’s Center</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brian Card</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident, President of U Street Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Steve Callcott</td>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, DC Office of Planning/Historic Preservation</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tim Christensen</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident, President of the Logan Circle Community Association</td>
<td>September 2011, July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Staff</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Staff</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Volunteer</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Volunteer</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DCCAH Staff</td>
<td>DCCAH Staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Linda Harper</td>
<td>Executive Director, Cultural Tourism DC 2007-2013</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Natalie Hopkinson</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident, Journalist</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evelyn Kasongo</td>
<td>Neighborhood Planner, Ward 8 (Anacostia), DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Carla Kim</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Beverly Lancaster</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Volunteer</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jane Freundel Levey</td>
<td>Director of Heritage and Community Programs, Cultural Tourism DC</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lincoln Theatre Staff</td>
<td>Lincoln Theatre Staff</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Marquis Lyons</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Volunteer</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vera McCall</td>
<td>Former Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Marya McQuirter</td>
<td>Former Cultural Tourism DC Staff, Historian</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Member of the Press Covering Cultural Tourism DC</td>
<td>Local Journalist</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brianne Nadeau</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident, Former ANC 1B Commissioner</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Scott Pomeroy</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident, Former 14th U Main Streets President</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Claire Riesenberg</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>U Street/Shaw Resident Anonymous #1</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>U Street/Shaw Resident Anonymous #2</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>U Street/Shaw Resident Anonymous #3</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>U Street/Shaw Resident Anonymous #4</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Month/Year of Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Raksha Vasudevan</td>
<td>Neighborhood Resident</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Eldra Walker</td>
<td>Former Shaw Neighborhood Historic Preservation Planner, DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>WalkingTown DC Volunteer</td>
<td>Cultural Tourism DC Volunteer</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wash Walks Tour Guide</td>
<td>Wash Walks Tour Guide for U Street Heritage Tour</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wash Walks Tour Participant</td>
<td>Neighborhood Tourist to U Street/Shaw</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pat Wheeler</td>
<td>Former Director of Marketing, Cultural Tourism DC</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From, Author. Not an exhaustive list, but includes all formal interviewees.