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This document was produced as a result of the many, many hours of time committed to this project by Enderly Park residents. In addition, the efforts of undergraduate students at UNC-Charlotte in the 2015 Geography classes “Social Inequality and Planning” & “Neighborhood Planning Seminar” assisted the research team with valuable data collection. The work has been part of a longstanding partnership between Enderly Park Neighborhood and the Charlotte Action Research Project (CHARP). CHARP forges partnerships between the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and marginalized communities in Charlotte, and takes a starting point in recognizing a neighborhood’s assets and listening first to community concerns. Central to its mission, CHARP consistently and proactively seeks to integrate teaching, research, and action to work towards a larger agenda of social justice, enable neighborhoods to advocate for themselves, and create sustainable neighborhood coalitions to implement structural change (CHARP, 2015).
1. Introduction

This project is the culmination of a six-year partnership between Enderly Park residents and the Charlotte Action Research Project (CHARP). The project describes the context and process of a neighborhood safety audit that was conducted in August 2015 following almost nine months of planning.

This booklet is intended to provide:

1.) A detailed account of Enderly Park’s rich history and achievements as a starting point for future action
2.) A summary of the safety audit process and a discussion of key findings
3.) A summary of issue specific resources and broader long term goals

What is included in this document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Organizing</th>
<th>Safety Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first section of this document details key historical events uncovered during archival research completed by UNC-Charlotte graduate students in partnership with the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association. This information gathering process along with many meetings and reflections set the stage for the audit to begin. This section provides neighborhood context.</td>
<td>The report also discusses the safety audit process, and describes in detail how a safety audit was carried out in Enderly Park and the resulting findings of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the findings of the safety audit as a starting point, the concluding sections provide both large scale long term goals as well as detailed, issue specific resources for neighborhood residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document is a detailed account of how the safety audit tool was adapted to better suit the needs in this local context. Several resources are laid out to provide information for residents to begin to make progress on several short term goals which will lay the foundation for action on larger more complex issues.
2. Neighborhood Context

The history of Enderly Park is the story of a neighborhood that has experienced drastic changes over the years. National trends, proximity to other neighborhoods, and progression through time have shaped neighborhood conditions. From 1920-1980, Enderly Park was a white, blue-collar middle class residential neighborhood. Yet, because of its proximity to growing African American communities, Enderly Park transformed into a predominately black community.

Figure 1: Historical Timeline

**THEN**

- Pre 1911
  - Rural Farming Community
- 1917
  - Camp Greene Army Base Opens
- 1935-1949
  - Development in neighboring Wesley Heights progresses
- Post 1940
  - Glenwood Neighborhood begins to be called Enderly Park
- 1970's
  - Neighborhood decline is documented
- 1980
  - Demographics in Neighborhood drastically change

**NOW**

- 2009
  - Enderly Park and CHARP begin partnership
- 2010
  - Quality of Life Study redraws neighborhood boundaries
- 2014
  - Safety Audit Project begins
2.1 Pre 1911
Enderly Park’s beginnings resemble that of many other Charlotte neighborhoods. It began as a rural farming area with a dispersed community structure. Commerce was limited to a couple of stores and inns. Churches were the most prominent institutions. They served multiple purposes from providing religious services to hosting community events.

What truly sparked the growth of West Charlotte, and consequently Enderly Park, was the federal government’s decision to build an army base in Charlotte during World War I. The majority of Camp Greene, a 6,000-acre base, was located just south of Enderly Park with Tuckaseegee Road entering the north section of the camp (Geske, 2012). Though the camp was short lived; it brought massive growth in capital and population. The base successfully pressured the city to repair and expand Tuckaseegee and Dowd Roads, spurring even more growth. Drawing from this expansion, private owners developed available land from the closed Camp Greene and vacated farms (Geske, 2012).
2.2 1920’s to 1950’s
Enderly Park was an extension of ongoing development in Wesley Heights. As the City of Charlotte continued to annex land during this time, neighborhoods were able to rapidly expand as the city boundaries moved further out from city center. Throughout the 1920’s, two-thirds of Wesley Heights was developed, and began expanding to the northwest. Unlike many other neighborhoods, no previously established plan or single developer drove development (Geske, 2012). As a result, the neighborhood took shape incrementally. City maps made between 1935 and 1949 show slow but consistent growth as neighborhood boundaries expanded.

2.3 1960s to 1990s
Discriminatory housing practices greatly influenced where minority families could locate within the City of Charlotte. African Americans seeking to purchase homes had limited options prior to the passing of fair housing policies. Given its proximity to historically African American neighborhoods such as Wesley Heights and Biddleville, Enderly Park was appealing to many African American homebuyers because the community offered an upgrade in housing stock at a cheaper price while still close to existing social networks. This marked the beginning of change in neighborhood demographics within Enderly Park. The 1980s saw the population of Enderly Park change from a predominantly white population to a predominantly black population. Older white residents of the neighborhood began to pass away; their children and grandchildren who opted for suburban homes oftentimes sold or rented their parents’ properties instead of occupying them.
2.4 2000s
The Charlotte Action Research Project (CHARP) has been engaged with Greater Enderly Park since 2009. Together, Greater Enderly Park and CHARP have completed several small-scale projects and neighborhood improvements. Examples of collaboration include: creating neighborhood strategic planning documents with graduate students enrolled in a community planning workshop, neighborhood book drive, holiday parties, recycling and neighborhood cleanup events, securing funding for and implementation of community garden, festivals and neighborhood gatherings. Over the course of this partnership, CHARP and Greater Enderly Park have engaged in activities that have strengthened the relationship between the two partners and created opportunities for both groups to learn from one another.

Graduate student Jabari Adams worked with the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association for two years from 2011-2012. He worked with residents to create a sustainable community garden space in the neighborhood, funded by a Crossroads Charlotte Front Porch Grant. The Greater Enderly Park Neighborhood Association conducted a number of food drives, book drives, neighborhood cleanups, and community events during our partnership. Starting in 2014 Enderly Park residents began engaging with CHARP in the Women’s Safety Audit, a tool used worldwide to explore safety issues that affect women and children and seek to address those issues (Whitzman, et al, 2009).

During the 2010 cycle of the biannual Quality of Life Study created in partnership with the Urban Institute at UNC Charlotte and the City of Charlotte, four neighborhoods were merged into one. The neighborhoods of Beechwood, Parkview, Glenwood, and Enderly Park are now considered to be “Greater Enderly Park”. Since this merge, the four neighborhoods have worked, with some challenges, to organize in a unified way.
2.5 Community Context Today

Today Enderly Park is an active neighborhood with three active neighborhood organizations, a community and recreation center, several places of worship, local businesses, nonprofit organizations, and open space. Figure 3 highlights key community features.

Table 1 highlights a variety of socioeconomic indicators derived from the Charlotte Mecklenburg Quality of Life Study. Statistics show that Enderly Park is an affordable neighborhood rich in diversity. However, the data do show that the neighborhood faces challenges. Household income, educational attainment, and crime rates continue to be lagging behind county averages. This document also acknowledges that these indicators tell only a part of the story. Figure 3 situates Enderly Park within the larger Charlotte region.
Figure 3: Enderly Park Community Context
Table 1: Quality of Life Indicators (Charlotte Quality of Life Study, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Enderly Park</th>
<th>Mecklenburg County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Residents</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minority</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Employment</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>$24,154</td>
<td>$56,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Performance</td>
<td>18% Proficient EOG score</td>
<td>51% Proficient EOG Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rental Cost</td>
<td>$782</td>
<td>$913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>21 per 1,000 people</td>
<td>4.2 per 1,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ridership</td>
<td>61 boardings per stop</td>
<td>114 boardings per stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Enderly Park location
The Neighborhood Safety Audit Project in Enderly Park was an intentional process of action research, planning, and reflection. A core group of participants were first identified through the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association. This group of seven residents developed organically, as those residents expressed a particular interest in the project consistently, and participated in almost all meetings and WSA related events.

Beginning with group reflection about safety concerns in Enderly Park, the project entered the **planning** phase. During this phase the steering committee defined project goals, conducted outreach, and gathered preliminary data. After extensive planning over 8 months, the **safety audit** phase was conducted in a manner that was customized to Enderly Park’s context. Following the audit, residents and CHARP students pursued **findings and reflections** as a final phase. Graduate students organized data collected, residents provided insights to help inform project findings, and focus groups were conducted to determine next steps and reflect on the process. The following sections describe each of these three phases in greater detail.
3.1 Project Background
The Neighborhood Safety Audit (NSA) is the first action research project in Enderly Park to be done in partnership with CHARP. Through CHARP’s sustained engagement with Enderly Park, issues of safety and crime were continually brought to the forefront as primary concerns. Because of the proven value of the NSA and its alignment with the neighborhood’s goals, CHARP researchers and residents embarked on this research project.

Within the NSA process, Enderly Park residents were co-researchers, exploring their unique lived experiences. The safety audit process gives a voice to neighborhood residents as the experts of their community. There are many things that only Enderly Park residents are able to describe and evaluate because of the insight that comes with living in a neighborhood.
Greater Enderly Park is not the first place to use the safety audit tool. The Women’s Safety Audit (WSA) tool was first developed in Canada by Toronto’s Metro Action Committee on Public Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC) in 1989. METRAC employed this research tool specifically as a women’s safety audit. The audit process has since been adapted and used across the globe as well as garnering praise for its success. The WSA tool increases awareness of violence against vulnerable groups and helps neighbors and decision-makers understand how men and women experience the urban environment differently. By making a neighborhood safe for women, we can effectively make a neighborhood safe for all residents. The process gives legitimacy to women’s concerns and is an effective tool for building community safety.

Practically, the WSA brings individuals together to walk through a physical environment, evaluate how safe it feels to them, identify ways to make the space safer, and organize to bring about these changes. Using the WSA tool, neighborhoods can document existing assets and develop action steps to maximize those assets while minimizing concerns.

3.2 Planning
The group embarked on this project with the first goal being to develop a process where both residents and CHARP researchers could learn and benefit from one another. Along the way, several other goals were defined. These were divided into short, medium, and long-term goals. Table 2 outlines these goals.
Table 2: Goal Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Goals</th>
<th>Medium Term Goals</th>
<th>Long Term Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand Current Conditions in Enderly Park</td>
<td>Establish economic and wellness programs to provide alternative options to neighborhood youth</td>
<td>Hold the police and city government accountable for how they perceive, respond to, and plan for Enderly Park Neighborhood; create own neighborhood plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Enderly Park safer by identifying quick actionable items that can be addressed (ex: lighting, beautification)</td>
<td>Organize youth and prior criminal offenders to be neighborhood leaders</td>
<td>Create more economic opportunities for Enderly Park residents to indirectly reduce crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit neighborhood participants, organize residents</td>
<td>Turn local convenience stores into assets</td>
<td>Be an active member of a larger coalition of neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand existing conditions in Enderly Park by looking to case studies from other places and academic literature; find new strategies to adapt for use in Enderly Park</td>
<td>Develop plans for implementation of larger scale projects (ex: neighborhood grocery store).</td>
<td>Conduct follow up safety audit to measure progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Participatory Mapping

The group refined goals and developed an initial recruitment plan through participatory mapping. Maps help bring the narratives and cultural contexts relevant to participants to the forefront. The experiences of people are inextricably linked to place and space.

According to the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, "participatory mapping is a group-based qualitative research method that gives participants freedom to shape discussion on a given topic with minimal intervention from researchers. Mapping can generate a rich understanding of the connections between people, places and organizations over space and/or time" (2016).
The maps produced by residents with support from CHARP researchers served as an insightful dataset, which informed the rest of the safety audit process. From several participatory mapping exercises, conversations about topics such as neighborhood assets, resident fears, resident relationships, and resource gaps revealed relevant information about how residents perceive and experience their neighborhood. These maps highlighted safety priorities, resident perceptions, and areas of the neighborhood that are underrepresented and/or isolated from other neighborhood activities. Appendix A includes examples of maps produced during these participatory mapping exercises.

3.2.2 Recruitment

Recruitment for participation in the project took place primarily during the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association meetings. An example of METRAC’s WSA tool in its original form was first shared at a meeting attended by a group of nine residents on August 4th, 2014. A CHARP researcher attended all neighborhood meetings throughout the process. Two additional participants
were successfully recruited at neighborhood organization meetings. Recruitment efforts continued from August 2014 to September 2015.

Safety Audit meetings were held monthly, and at times bi-weekly. All residents whose contact information was on file with the neighborhood organization were invited to each meeting by phone and/or e-mail. Four additional participants were recruited through this process, though only one of them participated for the duration of the project.

Three door-to-door efforts were organized to distribute flyers inviting residents to participate in the safety audit process. These efforts were targeted at underrepresented areas within the neighborhood. The first door-to-door effort included UNC-Charlotte undergraduate students along with CHARP researchers. Flyers were also given to Bette Rae Thomas Center employees to pass out to visitors. CHARP researchers also distributed flyers to areas not able to be covered during the first flyering effort. After this flyering effort, residents expressed concerns about the gender-focused title of the project. Residents worried that it would limit participation in the process. After much discussion, it was decided that the project would be “rebranded” as the neighborhood safety audit, but that at each meeting we would reflect on the different experiences of men and women.

On September 11th, 2015, approximately 2 weeks prior to the audit, residents and CHARP researchers met at UNC-Charlotte Uptown Campus for a call-a-thon event. The goal was to call as many residents as possible to invite them to participate in the audit. Through this process, several residents expressed interest in participating. Appendix B includes both the flyer and call-a-thon invitation that were distributed.
3.2.3 Customizing the Audit Tool

The original safety audit tool shared at the August 2014 neighborhood meeting was revised several times based on resident feedback. Residents identified what parts of the tool they found confusing, unnecessary, or missing. CHARP researchers then revised the tool and presented it at the next meeting. This process continued for several meetings until a tool was developed that satisfied the group. This tool was then tested for usefulness by a group of six residents and two CHARP researchers within an area immediately surrounding the Bette Rae Thomas Center.

During this trial-run the tool was supplemented by photography at each data collection point. However, residents shared their concerns about openly photographing certain aspects in the neighborhood. This concern was addressed by pairing each resident with a student during the actual audit. The resident was simply asked to share their reflections while the student would take notes and take photos as necessary. This method was selected because it allowed for the most flexibility during the audit, while allowing residents to collect as much data as possible.

The specific context of Enderly Park influenced the adaptation of the safety audit tool by informing what would and would not be feasible. The process has previously been described as a group of women examining their urban environment as part of a large group activity (Whitzman, et al, 2009). However, neighborhood conflicts in Enderly Park were not conducive to this model. The dynamics of the core safety audit group were largely established long before the project started. These facets of neighborhood history and conflict (not uncommon in participatory action research) often guided group discussion and were “deal breakers” for several participants. The safety audit methods were
adjusted to ensure that data was gathered from the largest number of residents, while still providing a more private audit experience. Despite this effort, many group discussions often reverted to an “us vs. them” conflict. These conflicts further curtailed the NSA process, as it often required CHARP researchers to act as mediators between homeowners and renters, new and old residents, or other quarreling residents. A copy of the audit tool that was used is included in Appendix C.

3.3 Audit Day

The audit took place on September 27\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 at the Better Rae Thomas Center in Enderly Park. In total, 7 residents participated in the actual audit. While several other residents participated at some point during the process.

The audit was conducted in pairs consisting of one Greater Enderly Park resident and one CHARP researcher or UNC-Charlotte student. Pairs were given a map delineated with a suggested route and several copies of the audit tool. Assuming that nearby conditions have the most direct implications regarding day-to-day safety, residents were asked to audit the space closest to their home. Each audit area included the street the resident lived on plus the adjacent two to three block area. The resident was asked to provide reflections or personal narratives as related to any aspect of safety along the route, while
the other team member took extensive notes on their commentary. This allowed residents to share their free flowing thoughts uninterrupted, and provided valuable experiential learning to graduate and undergraduate students. In total, a majority of the neighborhood was audited, but not all. The audit was limited by time and resident turnout.

3.4 Findings

The findings from the safety audit provide a good starting point for reflection and future projects. Participants acknowledge that the audit is only one piece of a long-term strategy for improved safety in the neighborhood. Despite the small group of participants, resident comments and narratives came from a diverse set of viewpoints. However, it is clear from the audit that reoccurring themes exist. These themes included environmental concerns, crime and police relations, neighborhood isolation, maintenance and appearance challenges, and lacking transportation infrastructure. After many discussions with neighborhood residents and analysis of the audit data, we were able to understand how the different aspects of safety in Enderly Park are interconnected, both to one another and to the overarching concept of structural inequality. Table 3 highlights some key reflections obtained during the safety audit.

Perhaps it is not surprising that the five categories are interrelated, as they all play a role in neighborhood dynamics. All of the themes relate to structural and institutional based inequalities that contribute to the long-term blight of low-income minority neighborhoods. For example, “trouble makers” in Enderly Park (as reported by the Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department) are largely small-time drug dealers and prostitutes trying to cope with debilitating addiction. Structurally, these types of crimes are often driven by inopportunity and a lack of supportive community resources (Sampson, 1995; Troutt, 2014).
Table 3: Neighborhood concerns identified during audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Sample Comments &amp; Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>• “That area is a mess, GE left a hazardous waste site”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “There are several homes built in floodplains”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents perceive there to be several brownfield sites, several do exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heavy rail cuts through the back yards of several homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance and Appearance</strong></td>
<td>• There are lots of eye sores, lots of trash, stuff that has been there for years”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Several large scale vacant buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A few burned out homes were documented, which remain in disarray for at least several weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Several boarded up vacant homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Police Relations</strong></td>
<td>• “I don’t feel safe reporting the crime because they say it’s anonymous but it’s really not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “They say call 911 and I do, but nothing happens”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Women are targeted by loitering and other people on the street, makes it uncomfortable to walk alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I can hear gunshots at night, but I have to just tune it out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>• Better markings are needed for pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Several crosswalks were put in, but never completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The neighborhood is quick and fast”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong></td>
<td>• “I feel safe in my house, so I just try to out and in quickly, don’t go out much”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When I’m walking home from the bus stop, I just keep my head down and keep moving”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I can’t go outside and enjoy my front porch because of all the parties and people in the street, so I just sit on the back porch and try not to let it bother me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I’m fine as long as nobody messes with me”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crime, underwhelming maintenance, unfinished transportation projects, and structural inequality converge in Enderly Park give rise to feelings of isolation
among many residents. The natural environment also contributes to the sense of isolation, as there are several sites within the neighborhood perceived to be hazardous or contaminated. Officially, the Enderly Park neighborhood contains one Superfund site, three hazardous waste sites, and one toxic release site (EPA Environmental Justice View, 2015). The neighborhood safety audit (NSA) approach allowed CHARP researchers and Enderly Park residents to take a holistic view of safety in the neighborhood, including those safety risks related to criminal activity and health, to further an understanding of how these various issues reinforce one another.

Despite the many issues identified in the safety audit, every participant also reflected on the pride they have in their neighborhood (Table 4). Most residents involved in the NSA process expressed an emotional bond between themselves and the Enderly Park neighborhood, suggesting varying levels of place attachment (Brown and Brown, 2003). The majority of participants are long-time homeowners, having lived in Enderly Park for more than thirty years. However, two renters also participated in the safety audit and both had been renting in the neighborhood for at least a decade. The Enderly Park neighborhood also has many residents who had originally lived in the area, left for a time, and then returned—thus suggesting that many residents truly do enjoy their neighborhood. This is important to note, as neighborhood pride is especially meaningful when trying to foster lasting neighborhood leadership.
Table 4: Positive comments during audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Reflections</th>
<th>Sample Comments and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Place</td>
<td>• “These fruit trees are the best in the neighborhood. The fruit trees make this very peaceful and safe feeling here, even though it is a vacant lot. They add a pleasant feel to the neighborhood that is missing in other places.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The home of Ms. Bette Rae is an asset to the community and reminds everyone of what the neighborhood could be”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I love this neighborhood, all of the beautiful trees, my friends and it is the best location in Charlotte”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Most of my neighbors are kind, not rough like some would think”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “When residents are able to afford to upgrade their homes, this is a great sign. I am happy for my neighbors when they are able to do this”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Focus Groups

Following the safety audit, a focus group was conducted with all residents who were engaged at any time during the safety audit process, from August 2014 to September 2015. The goals of the focus group were threefold. First, both CHARP researchers and residents wanted to understand barriers to sustained participation. Secondly, CHARP researchers wanted to learn about how the process worked from the perspective of the residents, and how the process could have worked differently. Lastly, CHARP researchers wanted to understand
what residents perceived as the logical next steps in the process. Nine residents participated in the focus group.

Participant Demographics:

- 7 women, 2 men
- 8 homeowners, 1 renter
- 3 White, 1 Asian, and 5 African American
- All participants approximately 40 years and older
- 3 participants engaged during entire process, 3 participants engaged during most of the process, and 3 participants engaged intermittently.

Key findings from the focus groups are summarized below.

1. Barriers to Sustained Participation
   - Time limits
   - Other volunteer opportunities more salient
   - Lack of new ideas; Felt there was nothing else they could contribute
   - Neighborhood conflicts

2. Audit Process Reflections
   - Participatory mapping increased participants’ awareness of neighborhood conditions and helped visualize assets and challenges
   - Participatory mapping helped to clarify what issues should be priorities
   - The audit process revealed new challenges and new assets that they were not previously aware of
   - Residents felt that UNC-Charlotte students who audited the neighborhood with them were sincerely interested in the neighborhood’s efforts
   - Safety audit process urged participants to become more involved in neighborhood organization and other issue based organizations
• The process introduced some residents to others and expanded existing social networks

3. Next Steps
• Residents have a strong desire to build on the momentum from the project and translate data into action
• Participants want concrete plans for a final outcome
• Desire to continue to work on concern categories
• Participants stress that more involved residents are needed
• Participants are interested in exploring subcommittees
• Participants want their work acknowledged by city, desire to present findings
4. Community Resources

Following the focus group, CHARP researchers spent time compiling resource information for each concern category to provide a foundation of information residents could use to take action on small, short-term issues that can be tackled in the short term. It is the hope of residents and CHARP researchers that if subcommittees, with the support of CHARP researchers, can carry out several “quick wins” in a reasonable amount of time, other residents will be motivated to become engaged (Weick, 1984). It is the goal of this section to provide a database of information to remove some of the research needed and obstacles to getting started.

Residents decided to focus on four subcommittees initially. These include: environment, housing, transportation, and crime. It is planned that these subcommittees will be organized in phases, with residents selecting one subcommittee to “staff” first, before moving on to others.

The following pages provide a conceptual outline of each committee that can be used by neighborhood residents as a starting point. However, these subcommittees will be shaped by those who join them, and evolve over time. A resource list with contact information is included in the appendix.
4.1 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee

**Assets**
- Greenway Access
- Access to I-85
- Bus Routes

**Challenges**
- Infrastructure in poor condition, including sidewalks and roads
  - Speeding
  - Lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities

**Project Ideas**
- Measure response times for infrastructure repairs
- Compare bus headways with buses in similar neighborhoods
- Monitor and document speeding

**Key Contacts**
- Charlotte Department of Transportation
4.2 Environment Subcommittee

- Greenway Access
- Community Parks and Open Space
- Creeks
- Old age trees

Assets

- Flooding areas
- Hazardous Waste Sites
- Illegal garbage dumping

Challenges

- Evaluate land uses to identify environmental justice issues
- Beautification
- Educational outreach

Project Ideas

- EPA
- NCDNR
- Sustain Charlotte

Key Contacts

- EPA
- NCDNR
- Sustain Charlotte
4.3 Police Relations and Crime Subcommittee

**Assets**
- Project Safe Program in Place
- Community Officers

**Challenges**
- Turnover of Community Officers
- Negative perception of neighborhood
- Flow of crime from other areas into Enderly Park

**Project Ideas**
- Develop alternative youth programs
- Build relationships with neighbors
- Dismantling Racism Training

**Key Contacts**
- Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department
- Juvenile Justice Center
- Charlotte School of Law
4.4 Housing Subcommittee

- Ample supply of affordable housing
- Diverse housing types
- Mix of renters and owners

- Threat of gentrification
- Several vacant homes
- Absentee landlords
- Maintenance needs

- Letter campaigns to absent landlords
- Welcome new neighbor program
- Animal welfare monitoring
- Host repair trainings and maintenance workshops

- Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership
- Neighborhood and Business Services/Code Enforcement
- QC Family Tree
- CPCC, Lowes, Home Depot

Assets

Challenges

Project Ideas

Key Contacts
4.5 Recruitment

In order to be successful each subcommittee will need to recruit participants and supporters. The selection of an appropriate recruitment method will maximize the committee’s effectiveness in recruiting new participants. A combination of techniques is a useful strategy. Residents and CHARP researchers agree that recruitment is crucial in order for the audit to progress in a meaningful way.

Key Principles

- Define roles
- Accept all kinds of participation
- Make visible changes
- Make room for all voices
- Establish good group dynamics
- Set realistic goals and adapt strategy as needed

Recruitment Methods

- Newsletter
- Social Media
- Door-to-Door
- Block Captains
- Youth Driven Recruitment
- Snowballing
- Issue based recruitment
- Location based recruitment
5. Conclusion

A key strength of the WSA tool is its adaptability. The unique history and neighborhood dynamics of Enderly Park informed the final draft of the tool. This document describes the process used to plan, recruit, and customize the safety audit tool for the local context. Relationship building activities, participatory mapping, and reflection were key strategies used in this project.

The safety audit process in the Enderly Park neighborhood helped inform neighborhood priorities and highlighted strong neighborhood attachment. The audit identified neighborhood challenges and assets in key areas of transportation, housing, environment, and safety. Now that data has been collected on existing conditions, several resources are laid out to provide information for residents to begin to leverage assets and tackle challenges.
Figure 3: Examples of participatory maps created. Several iterations of maps were created as the group continued to reflect on data collected and resident feedback.
B. Flyers and Outreach Documents

The Greater Enderly Park Neighborhood is trying to shine a light on important safety issues in the neighborhood. The first step in this process is to understand exactly what kind of safety concerns exist in the area, and get them well documented. In order to do this, the neighborhood association is in the process of planning to conduct a women’s safety audit. A women’s safety audit is a tool designed to empower women to critically analyze their surroundings and identify areas and policies in need of change. Through this process residents are able to engage with municipal authorities and other community institutions in the neighborhood to document safety concerns and understand why they make the neighborhood unsafe. Issues such as crime, maintenance, traffic, or lighting are all topics that can be addressed during a safety audit. This process has the ability to address some issues immediately, and also facilitate long term planning for sustained change. Women’s safety audits are not successful without local residents, as they are the experts regarding their own neighborhood.

Saturday
SEPTEMBER 27th
9:00 AM
BETTE RAE THOMAS
COMMUNITY CENTER

Safety for women and children is safety for all!

For questions, or to get involved: Contact CHARP office at 704-687-1310
Greater Enderly Park Volunteer Pledge Sheet

NAME____________________________________________________________

ADDRESS________________________________________________________

PHONE__________________________________________________________

EMAIL___________________________________________________________

I prefer to be reached by (circle all that apply): PHONE   EMAIL   MAIL   IN-PERSON

I am interested in (Circle all that apply)

- Neighborhood beautification
- crime watch
- animal welfare
- housing rehab
- General civic/community protection
- event organization
- environmental protection
- Welcome committee activities
- gardening
- cooking
- youth
- General organization duties
- recruitment
- newsletter/social media
- Transit/trails
- outdoors
- OTHER:____________________________

I AM AVAILABLE FOR ______ HRS/WEEK:
(doesn’t matter if you are available for 10 mins or 10 hours, we need you!)

These days work best: (circle all that apply)

MONDAY  TUESDAY  WEDNESDAY  THURSDAY  FRIDAY  SATURDAY  SUNDAY
Enderly Park
Call-a-Thon

Please call for more information or to RSVP....

September 11th 2014
6:00pm-8:00pm
UNCC Center City Bldg.
320 E. 9th St.

CHARP Office Phone
704-687-1310
Call-a-Thon Script
Resident name: __________________________________________________________

Resident address: ________________________________________________________

Resident phone number: ________________________________________________

Resident email: ___________________________________________________________

Hi ________________________________________________________________

My name is ______________________and I am also a resident in the Greater Enderly Park area. I have been given your name as someone who might be interested in joining a project to improve safety in the neighborhood. We will be holding an event on Saturday September 27 where we will walk through the neighborhood as groups to identify areas that need improvement. Would you be interested in helping us improve safety in the Greater Enderly Park area or do you have any questions?

(if yes) Great! Could I get some information from you to help us stay in contact leading up to the event?

(If no) Thank you for your time. Is it ok to use this number to contact you in the future about other events?
Confirm information

Is this the best number to reach you at or is there one that is better?

_________________________________________________________________________

Can I confirm that your email address is

_________________________________________________________________________

Can I confirm that that you live at

_________________________________________________________________________

Is there anyone else that you know who might like to be contacted about the event? Do you have their phone number?

_________________________________________________________________________

Closing

Thank you again for your time and interest in helping to make the Greater Enderly Park area a safer place to live and work. Have a nice evening!
C. Audit Tool

WOMEN’S SAFETY AUDIT TOOL

RESIDENTS:____________________________________________________

MODERATOR:__________________________________________________

NEAREST INTERSECTION:__________________________________________

(Please include an address, business name, or any other information needed to fully understand the reflections when appropriate)

PHOTOS TAKEN? (Circle One) YES NO

Reflections
(Please be sure to identify it is a positive or negative reflection, and try to answer the question of “why does this resident feel safe or unsafe in this area?” Did something happen in this area in the past? Are there positive or negative memories associated with this place?”)
D. Focus Group Questions

1. Have you observed any changes in your relationships with other residents since participating in the Women’s Safety Audit?
2. Have you observed any changes in your relationships with neighborhood organizations or city departments since participating in the Women’s Safety Audit?
3. Can you identify any changes in the way that your neighborhood association has functioned since the Women’s Safety Audit?
4. Are decisions made and actions implemented differently than before the group participated in the Women’s Safety Audit? How so?
5. What are some of the major problems that you see evident in your neighborhood?
6. What do you think are the causes of these problems?
7. Do you understand these issues differently than before participating in the Women’s Safety Audit?
8. Has the Women’s Safety Audit allowed you to address these issues? How so?
9. Are you reacting differently to these issues than before your participation in the Women’s Safety Audit?
10. How has your involvement in the Women’s Safety Audit altered your feelings of self-worth, self-respect, and empowerment? How do you view yourself after being engaged in the process? How do you see your neighborhood after being involved in the audit?
11. (for non-resident participants) Can you identify any changes in the way you interact with neighborhood residents since your involvement with the Women’s Safety Audit?
E. Resource Contact List

Recruitment
• Neighborhood Activity Ideas: http://neighborhoodday.org/
• Organizing Toolkit: http://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/LCAT_Take_Action_Create_Change_-_Community_Organizing_Toolkit.pdf
• Neighborhood Association Toolkit: https://www.athensclarkecounty.com/DocumentCenter/Home/View/314

Transportation and Infrastructure
• Sidewalk Related Concerns: Sonji Mosley (704)-336-3214 and Sam Barber (704)-336-4721
• Charlotte DOT Field Service Coordinators: Chip Gallup, (704) 336-3922 and Terry VonCannon, (704) 336-6786

Environment
• EPA NC District 4: (404) 562-9900
• Hazardous Waste Sites: http://www.epa.gov/myenvironment/

Safety
• NC Crime Stoppers: (704)-334-1600
• Rape Agression Defense: (704)-378-1403, ext.1004 OR (704)-687-8300
• NC Safety Programs: (954)-907-7587
• CMPD Workshops: http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/CMPD/organization/Administrative/Po liceTrainingAcademy/Pages/Citizens%20Academy.aspx
• Anti-Defamation League and Anti-Bias Training: http://www.adl.org/educationoutreach/anti-bias-education/c/anti-bias-training-forlaw.html#.VWUNkLViko
• Charlotte School of Law: Pro-bono legal counseling, http://www.charlottelaw.edu/index.php
• Civil Rights Clinic (http://cslcivilrights.com/contactus/)

Housing
• Charlotte Housing Partnership: http://www.cmhp.org/
• Emergency Rental Assistance: http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/nbs/housing/pages/emergencyrentalassistance.aspx
• Habitat for Humanity Critical Home Repair: 
http://www.habitatcharlotte.org/home-ownership-home-repair/critical-home-repair
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This document was produced as a result of the many, many hours of time committed to this project by Enderly Park residents. Residents took on leadership roles in planning, recruiting, and analyzing the findings of this research project. Residents also provided several rounds of feedback, edits, and comments on this product. In addition, the efforts of undergraduate students at UNC-Charlotte in the 2015 Geography classes “Social Inequality and Planning” & “Neighborhood Planning Seminar” assisted the research team with valuable data collection. The work has been part of a longstanding partnership between the Enderly Park Neighborhood and the Charlotte Action Research Project (CHARP). CHARP is a team of graduate researchers and faculty who work closely on neighborhood based research with community partners. CHARP forges partnerships between the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and marginalized communities in Charlotte, and takes a starting point in recognizing a neighborhood’s assets and listening first to community concerns. Central to its mission, CHARP consistently and proactively seeks to integrate teaching, research, and action to work towards a larger agenda of social justice, enable neighborhoods to advocate for themselves, and create sustainable neighborhood coalitions to implement structural change (Charlotte Action Research Project, 2015).
1. Introduction

This project is the culmination of a six-year partnership between Enderly Park residents and the Charlotte Action Research Project (CHARP). The project describes the context and process of a neighborhood safety audit that was conducted in August 2015 following almost nine months of planning. The project utilizes the Women’s Safety Audit methodology, which is defined as a process that brings individuals together to walk through a physical environment, evaluate how safe it feels to them, identify ways to make the space safer and organize to bring about these changes (Whitzman, Shaw, Andrew, & Travers, 2009).

This product is intended to provide:

1.) An example of information collected about a specific neighborhood’s history and how that information provided a more complete understanding of neighborhood context
2.) A description of the process to customize a safety audit tool and a discussion of key findings
3.) A guide for taking the first steps towards translating safety audit findings into action
4.) An honest reflection of safety audit challenges and barriers
What is included in this document?

### Neighborhood Context

The first section of this document details key historical events uncovered during research about the history of the project focus area, completed by UNC-Charlotte graduate students in partnership with the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association. This information gathering process along with many meetings and reflections set the stage for the audit to begin. This section provides neighborhood context.

### Safety Audit

The report also discusses the safety audit process, and describes in detail how a safety audit was carried out in Enderly Park and the resulting findings of the project.

### Next Steps

Using the findings of the safety audit as a starting point, the concluding sections both summarize and provide a guide about how safety audit findings can be translated into action. This section also reflects on challenges of the project.

It is the hope of the authors that this product is useful to both researchers and community members who wish to engage in their own collaborative safety audit process. This product documents the safety audit experience through the lens of a university-community partnership. Thus, this document will best serve audiences engaged in work with both community-based and institutional partners. Some community groups with established capacity and technical expertise could use this document as a way to develop their own safety audit process independently. Other community groups may find this document useful for identifying how their local expert knowledge can complement the technical expertise of the appropriate institutional partner to tackle issues of neighborhood safety.
2. Neighborhood Context

The history of Enderly Park is the story of a neighborhood that has experienced drastic changes over the years. From 1920-1980, Enderly Park was a white, blue-collar middle class residential neighborhood. Yet, because of its proximity to growing African American communities, Enderly Park transformed into a predominately black community. **Figure 1** highlights some of the key moments in the neighborhood’s development that contribute to the understanding of this neighborhood’s local context.

*Figure 1: Historical Timeline*
2.1 Neighborhood Beginnings
Enderly Park’s beginnings resemble that of many other Charlotte neighborhoods. It began as a rural farming area with a dispersed community structure. Commerce was limited to a couple of stores and inns. Churches were the most prominent institutions. They served multiple purposes from providing religious services to hosting community events.

**Figure 2** displays one of the earliest maps of development in the Enderly Park area.

What truly sparked the growth of West Charlotte, and consequently Enderly Park, was the federal government’s decision to build an army base in Charlotte during World War I. The majority of Camp Greene, a 6,000-acre base, was located just south of Enderly Park (Geske, 2012). Though the camp was short lived; it brought massive growth in capital and population. The base successfully pressured the city to repair and expand Tuckaseegee and Dowd Roads, spurring more growth. Drawing from this expansion, private owners developed available land from the closed Camp Greene and vacated farms (Geske, 2012).
Enderly Park was an extension of ongoing development in Wesley Heights. As the City of Charlotte continued to annex land during this time, neighborhoods were able to rapidly expand as the city boundaries moved further out from city center. Throughout the 1920’s, two-thirds of Wesley Heights was developed, and began expanding to the northwest. Unlike many other neighborhoods, no previously established plan or single developer drove development (Geske, 2012). As a result, the neighborhood took shape incrementally. City maps made between 1935 and 1949 show slow but consistent growth as neighborhood boundaries expanded.

2.2 Changing Demographics

Discriminatory housing practices greatly influenced where minority families could locate within the City of Charlotte. African Americans seeking to purchase homes had limited options prior to the passing of fair housing policies. Given its proximity to historically African American neighborhoods such as Wesley Heights and Biddleville, Enderly Park was appealing to many African American homebuyers because the community offered an upgrade in housing stock at a cheaper price, while allowing families to remain close to their existing social networks. This marked the beginning of change in neighborhood demographics within Enderly Park. The 1980s saw the population of Enderly Park change from a predominantly white population to a predominantly black population. Older white residents of the neighborhood began to pass away; their children and grandchildren who opted for suburban homes oftentimes sold or rented their parents’ properties instead of occupying them.
2.3 CHARP and Enderly Park
CHARP has been engaged with Greater Enderly Park since 2009. Together, Greater Enderly Park and CHARP have completed several small-scale projects and neighborhood improvements. Examples of collaboration include: creating neighborhood strategic planning documents with graduate students enrolled in a community planning workshop, a neighborhood book drive, holiday parties, recycling and neighborhood cleanup events, securing funding for and implementation of a community garden, and festivals and neighborhood gatherings. Over the course of this partnership, CHARP and Greater Enderly Park have engaged in activities that have strengthened the relationship between the two partners and created opportunities for both groups to learn from one another.

Graduate student Jabari Adams worked with the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association for two years from 2011-2012. He worked with residents to create a sustainable community garden space in the neighborhood, funded by a Crossroads Charlotte Front Porch Grant. Starting in 2014 Enderly Park residents began engaging with CHARP in the Women’s Safety Audit, a tool used worldwide to explore safety issues that affect women and children and seek to address those issues (Whitzman et al., 2009).

During the 2010 cycle of the biannual Quality of Life Study created in partnership with the Urban Institute at UNC Charlotte and the City of Charlotte, four neighborhoods were merged into one. The neighborhoods of Beechwood, Parkview, Glenwood, and Enderly Park are now considered to be “Greater Enderly Park”. Since this merge, the four neighborhoods have worked, with some challenges, to organize in a unified way.
2.4 Community Context Today

Today Enderly Park is an active neighborhood with three active neighborhood organizations, a community and recreation center, several places of worship, local businesses, nonprofit organizations, and open space. Figure 3 highlights key community features.

Table 1 highlights a variety of socioeconomic indicators derived from the Charlotte Mecklenburg Quality of Life Study. Statistics show that Enderly Park is an affordable neighborhood, rich in diversity. However, the data do show that the neighborhood faces challenges. Household income, educational attainment, and crime rates continue to be less than ideal when compared to county averages. This document also acknowledges that these indicators tell only a part of the story. Figure 4 situates Enderly Park within the larger Charlotte region.
Figure 3: Enderly Park Community Context
Table 1: Quality of Life Indicators (Charlotte Quality of Life Study, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Enderly Park</th>
<th>Mecklenburg County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Residents</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minority</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>$24,154</td>
<td>$56,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Performance</td>
<td>18% Proficient EOG score</td>
<td>51% Proficient EOG Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rental Cost</td>
<td>$782</td>
<td>$913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>21 per 1,000 people</td>
<td>4.2 per 1,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ridership</td>
<td>61 boardings per stop</td>
<td>114 boardings per stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Enderly Park location
3. Neighborhood Safety Audit

The Neighborhood Safety Audit Project in Enderly Park was an intentional process of action research, planning, and reflection. A core group of participants were first identified through the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association. This group of seven residents was already actively engaged in the neighborhood association. The core group developed organically, as those residents expressed a particular interest in the project consistently, and participated in almost all meetings and WSA related events.

Beginning with group reflection about safety concerns in Enderly Park, the project entered the planning phase. During this phase the steering committee, comprised of 7 residents and CHARP researchers, collaboratively defined project goals, conducted outreach, and gathered preliminary data. After extensive planning over 8 months, the safety audit phase was conducted in a manner that was customized to Enderly Park’s context. A group of seven residents, including some residents from the initial steering committee, participated in the audit. Following the audit, residents and CHARP members organized findings and reflections as a final phase. This phase included residents from the first two phases, as well as newly engaged residents. Graduate students organized data collected and residents provided insights to help inform project findings. Focus groups were conducted to determine next steps and reflect on the process. The following sections describe each of these three phases in greater detail. Figure 5 provides a general overview of the entire safety audit process.
3.1 Project Background
The Neighborhood Safety Audit (NSA) is the first action research project in Enderly Park to be done in partnership with CHARP. Through CHARP’s sustained engagement with Enderly Park, issues of safety and crime were continually brought to the forefront as primary concerns. Because of the proven value of the NSA and its alignment with the neighborhood’s goals, CHARP researchers and residents embarked on this research project.

Within the NSA process, Enderly Park residents were co-researchers, exploring their unique lived experiences. The safety audit process gives a voice to neighborhood residents as the experts of their community. There are many
things that only Enderly Park residents are able to describe and evaluate because of the insight that comes with living in their neighborhood.

Greater Enderly Park is not the first place to use the safety audit tool. Toronto’s Metro Action Committee on Public Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC) first developed the Women’s Safety Audit (WSA) tool in 1989. METRAC employed this research tool specifically as a women’s safety audit. The audit process has since been adapted and used across the globe as well as garnering praise for its success. The WSA tool increases awareness of violence against vulnerable groups and helps neighbors and decision-makers understand how men and women experience the urban environment differently. By making a neighborhood safe for women, we can effectively make a neighborhood safe for all residents. The process gives legitimacy to women’s concerns and is an effective tool for building community safety (Whitzman et al., 2009).

In practice, the WSA brings individuals together to walk through a physical environment, evaluate how safe it feels to them, identify ways to make the space safer, and organize to bring about these changes (Whitzman et al., 2009). Using the WSA tool, neighborhoods can document existing assets and develop action steps to maximize those assets while minimizing concerns.

3.2 Planning
The group embarked on this project with the first goal being to develop a process where both residents and CHARP researchers could learn and benefit from one another. Along the way, several other goals were defined. These were divided into short, medium, and long-term goals. Table 2 outlines these goals. These goals were developed by the steering committee, which included seven residents and CHARP researchers.
### Table 2: Goal Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Goals</th>
<th>Medium Term Goals</th>
<th>Long Term Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand Current Conditions in Enderly Park</td>
<td>Establish economic and wellness programs to provide alternative options to neighborhood youth</td>
<td>Hold the police and city government accountable for how they perceive, respond to, and plan for Enderly Park Neighborhood; create own neighborhood plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Enderly Park safer by identifying quick actionable items that can be addressed (ex: lighting, beautification)</td>
<td>Organize youth and prior criminal offenders to be neighborhood leaders</td>
<td>Create more economic opportunities for Enderly Park residents to indirectly reduce crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit neighborhood participants, organize residents</td>
<td>Turn local convenience stores into assets</td>
<td>Be an active member of a larger coalition of neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand existing conditions in Enderly Park by looking to case studies from other places and academic literature; find new strategies to adapt for use in Enderly Park</td>
<td>Develop plans for implementation of larger scale projects (ex: neighborhood grocery store).</td>
<td>Conduct follow up safety audit to measure progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2.1 Participatory Mapping

The steering committee group refined goals and developed an initial recruitment plan through participatory mapping. Figure 6 shows residents engaged in the participatory mapping process. Maps help bring the narratives and cultural contexts relevant to participants to the forefront. The experiences of people are inextricably linked to place and space.

According to the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, “participatory mapping is a group-based qualitative research method that gives participants freedom to shape discussion on a given topic with minimal intervention from researchers. Mapping can generate a rich understanding of the connections between people, places and organizations over space and/or time” (2016).
The maps produced by residents with support from CHARP researchers served as an insightful dataset, which informed the rest of the safety audit process. From several participatory mapping exercises, conversations about topics such as neighborhood assets, resident fears, resident relationships, and resource gaps revealed relevant information about how residents perceive and experience their neighborhood. These maps highlighted safety priorities, resident perceptions, and areas of the neighborhood that are underrepresented and/or isolated from other neighborhood activities. Appendix A includes examples of maps produced during these participatory mapping exercises.

3.2.2 Recruitment

Recruitment for participation in the project took place primarily during the Enderly Park Neighborhood Association meetings. An example of METRAC’s WSA tool in its original form was first shared at a meeting attended by a group of nine residents on August 4th, 2014. A CHARP researcher attended all neighborhood meetings throughout the process. Two additional participants...
were successfully recruited at neighborhood organization meetings. However, general participation at neighborhood meetings is relatively low, with approximately 15-20 residents at each meeting. In addition, many of the regular meeting attendees had already committed to participating in the audit. Thus, recruitment efforts continued from August 2014 to September 2015. Recruitment consisted of neighborhood flyering, door-to-door outreach, phone calls, and encouraged word-of-mouth.

Safety Audit meetings were held monthly, and at times bi-weekly. All residents whose contact information was on file with the neighborhood organization were invited to each meeting by phone and/or e-mail. Four additional participants were recruited through this process, though only one of them participated for the duration of the project.

Three door-to-door efforts were organized to distribute flyers inviting residents to participate in the safety audit process. These efforts were targeted at underrepresented areas within the neighborhood. The first door-to-door effort included UNC-Charlotte undergraduate students along with CHARP researchers. Flyers were also given to Bette Rae Thomas Center employees to pass out to visitors. CHARP researchers also distributed flyers to areas not able to be covered during the first flyering effort. After this flyering effort, residents expressed concerns about the gender-focused title of the project. Residents worried that it would limit participation in the process. After much discussion, it was decided that the project would be "rebranded" as the neighborhood safety audit, but that at each meeting we would reflect on the different experiences of men and women.

On September 11\textsuperscript{th}, 2015, approximately 2 weeks prior to the audit, residents and CHARP researchers met at UNC-Charlotte Uptown Campus for a call-a-thon
event. The goal was to call as many residents as possible to invite them to participate in the audit. Through this process, several residents expressed interest in participating. Appendix B includes both the flyer and call-a-thon invitation that were distributed.

It is important to note that during the entire safety audit process the seven residents who comprised the steering committee remained consistently engaged in the process. However, other residents engaged and re-engaged with the process at different points throughout the project. For example, two residents who were not engaged in the planning phase became heavily engaged at the audit and after. Additionally, other residents who participated in the planning and participatory mapping did not remain engaged for the duration of the project.

3.2.3 Customizing the Audit Tool

The original safety audit tool shared at the August 2014 neighborhood meeting was revised several times based on resident feedback. A WSA tool modeled after audit tools described by Whitzman and others is included in Appendix F. Residents identified what parts of the tool they found confusing, unnecessary, or missing. CHARP researchers then revised the tool and presented it at the next meeting. This process continued for several meetings until a tool was developed that satisfied the group. This tool was then tested for usefulness by a group of six residents (three from the steering committee, and three newly engaged residents) and two CHARP researchers within an area immediately surrounding the Bette Rae Thomas Center.
During this trial-run the tool was supplemented by photography at each data collection point. However, residents shared their concerns about openly photographing certain aspects in the neighborhood. This concern was addressed by pairing each resident with a student during the actual audit. The resident was simply asked to share their reflections while the student would take notes and take photos as necessary. This method was selected because it allowed for the most flexibility during the audit, while allowing residents to collect as much data as possible.

The specific context of Enderly Park influenced the adaptation of the safety audit tool by informing what would and would not be feasible. The process has previously been described as a group of women examining their urban environment as part of a large group activity (Whitzman et al., 2009). However, neighborhood conflicts in Enderly Park were not conducive to this model. The dynamics of the core safety audit group were largely established long before the project started. These facets of neighborhood history and conflict (not uncommon in participatory action research) often guided group discussion and were “deal breakers” for several participants. The safety audit methods were adjusted to ensure that data was gathered from the largest number of residents, while still providing a more private audit experience. Despite this effort, many group discussions often reverted to an “us vs. them” conflict. These conflicts further curtailed the NSA process, as it often required CHARP researchers to act as mediators between homeowners and renters, new and old residents, or other quarreling residents. A copy of the audit tool that was used is included in Appendix C.

3.3 Audit Day

The audit took place on September 27th, 2015 at the Better Rae Thomas Center in Enderly Park. In total, seven (five from the steering committee, and two
additional residents participated in the actual audit. Two additional residents conducted the audit on their own at a later date. One additional participant was given all the photos collected around her street and provided additional insights.

The audit was conducted in pairs consisting of one Greater Enderly Park resident and one CHARP researcher or UNC-Charlotte student. Pairs were given a map delineated with a suggested route and several copies of the audit tool. Assuming that nearby conditions have the most direct implications regarding day-to-day safety, residents were asked to audit the space closest to their home. Each audit area included the street the resident lived on plus the adjacent two to three block area. The resident was asked to provide reflections or personal narratives as related to any aspect of safety along the route, while the other team member took extensive notes on their commentary. This allowed residents to share their free flowing thoughts uninterrupted, and provided valuable experiential learning to graduate and undergraduate students. Figure 7 shows two residents on the day of the audit. A majority of the neighborhood was audited, but not all. The audit was limited by time and resident turnout.

3.4 Findings
The findings from the safety audit provide a good starting point for reflection and future projects. Participants acknowledge that the audit is only one piece of a long-term strategy for improved safety in the neighborhood. Despite the small group of participants, resident comments and narratives came from a diverse set of viewpoints. However, it is clear from the audit that reoccurring themes exist. These themes included environmental concerns, crime and police relations, neighborhood isolation, maintenance and appearance challenges, and lacking transportation infrastructure. After many discussions with neighborhood residents (both with those who participated in the audit and those who did not) and analysis of the audit data, we were able to understand how the different aspects of safety in Enderly Park are interconnected, both to one another and to the overarching concept of structural inequality. Table 3 highlights some key reflections obtained during the safety audit.

Perhaps it is not surprising that the five categories are interrelated, as they all play a role in neighborhood dynamics. All of the themes relate to structural and institutional based inequalities that contribute to the long-term blight of low-income minority neighborhoods. For example, “trouble makers” in Enderly Park (as reported by the Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department) are largely small-time drug dealers and prostitutes trying to cope with debilitating addiction. Structurally, these types of crimes are often driven by inopportune

d Table 3: Neighborhood concerns identified during audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Sample Comments &amp; Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>• “That area is a mess, GE left a hazardous waste site”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “There are several homes built in floodplains”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents perceive there to be several brownfield sites, several do exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heavy rail cuts through the back yards of several homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Appearance</td>
<td>• There are lots of eye sores, lots of trash,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crime, underwhelming maintenance, unfinished transportation projects, and structural inequality converge in Enderly Park give rise to feelings of isolation among many residents. The natural environment also contributes to the sense of isolation, as there are several sites within the neighborhood perceived to be hazardous or contaminated. Officially, the Enderly Park neighborhood contains one Superfund site, three hazardous waste sites, and one toxic release site (Environmental Protection Agency, 2015). The NSA approach allowed CHARP researchers and Enderly Park residents to take a holistic view of safety in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime and Police Relations</th>
<th>“I don’t feel safe reporting the crime because they say it’s anonymous but it’s really not”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They say call 911 and I do, but nothing happens”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women are targeted by loitering and other people on the street, makes it uncomfortable to walk alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I can hear gunshots at night, but I have to just tune it out”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Better markings are needed for pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several crosswalks were put in, but never completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The neighborhood is quick and fast”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>“I feel safe in my house, so I just try to out and in quickly, don’t go out much”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I’m walking home from the bus stop, I just keep my head down and keep moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can’t go outside and enjoy my front porch because of all the parties and people in the street, so I just sit on the back porch and try not to let it bother me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m fine as long as nobody messes with me”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

stuff that has been there for years"
- Several large scale vacant buildings
- A few burned out homes were documented, which remain in disarray for at least several weeks.
- Several boarded up vacant homes.
neighborhood, including those safety risks related to criminal activity and health, to further an understanding of how these various issues reinforce one another.

Despite the many issues identified in the safety audit, every participant also reflected on the pride they have in their neighborhood (Table 4). Most residents involved in the NSA process expressed an emotional bond between themselves and the Enderly Park neighborhood, suggesting varying levels of place attachment (Brown and Brown, 2003). The majority of participants are long-time homeowners, having lived in Enderly Park for more than thirty years. However, two renters also participated in the safety audit and both had been renting in the neighborhood for at least a decade. The Enderly Park neighborhood also has many residents who had originally lived in the area, left for a time, and then returned – thus suggesting that many residents truly do enjoy their neighborhood. This is important to note, as neighborhood pride is especially meaningful when trying to foster lasting neighborhood leadership.
3.5 Focus Groups

Following the safety audit, a focus group was conducted with the intention of including all residents who were engaged at any time during the safety audit process, from August 2014 to September 2015. The goals of the focus group were threefold. First, both CHARP researchers and residents wanted to understand barriers to sustained participation. Secondly, CHARP researchers wanted to learn about how the process worked from the perspective of the residents, and how the process could have worked differently. Lastly, CHARP researchers wanted to understand what residents perceived as the logical next steps in the process. Ultimately, nine residents participated in the focus group out of 25 who were engaged at any one point in the safety audit process.

Table 4: Positive comments during audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Reflections</th>
<th>Sample Comments and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Place</td>
<td>• “These fruit trees are the best in the neighborhood. The fruit trees make this very peaceful and safe feeling here, even though it is a vacant lot. They add a pleasant feel to the neighborhood that is missing in other places.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The home of Ms. Bette Rae is an asset to the community and reminds everyone of what the neighborhood could be.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I love this neighborhood, all of the beautiful trees, my friends and it is the best location in Charlotte.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Most of my neighbors are kind, not rough like some would think.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “When residents are able to afford to upgrade their homes, this is a great sign. I am happy for my neighbors when they are able to do this.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Demographics:

- 7 women, 2 men
- 8 homeowners, 1 renter
- 3 White, 1 Asian, and 5 African American
- All participants approximately 40 years and older
- 3 participants engaged during entire process, 3 participants engaged during most of the process, and 3 participants engaged intermittently.

Key findings from the focus groups are summarized below.

1. Barriers to Sustained Participation
   - Time limits
   - Other volunteer opportunities more salient
   - Lack of new ideas; Felt there was nothing else they could contribute
   - Neighborhood conflicts

2. Audit Process Reflections
   - Participatory mapping increased participants’ awareness of neighborhood conditions and helped visualize assets and challenges
   - Participatory mapping helped to clarify what issues should be priorities
   - The audit process revealed new challenges and new assets that they were not previously aware of
   - Residents felt that UNC-Charlotte students who audited the neighborhood with them were sincerely interested in the neighborhood’s efforts
   - Safety audit process urged participants to become more involved in neighborhood organization and other issue-based organizations
   - The process introduced some residents to others and expanded existing social networks
3. Next Steps

- Residents have a strong desire to build on the momentum from the project and translate data into action
- Participants want concrete plans for a final outcome
- Desire to continue to work on concern categories
- Participants stress that more involved residents are needed
- Participants are interested in exploring subcommittees
- Participants want their work acknowledged by city, desire to present findings

3.6 Project Challenges

The most pressing challenge to the safety audit process was the limited participation from a wider group of community residents. Despite varied and multiple recruitment attempts, turnout remained relatively low. During short interactions with residents during recruitment efforts several recurring responses emerged as explanations for not participating. These included:

- Limited time
- The overwhelming nature of tackling “neighborhood safety”
- The desire and intention to move out of the neighborhood as soon as possible
- Negative perception of neighborhood association
- Disagreements with other residents engaged, negative group dynamics
- General disinterest
Other neighborhood-based projects experienced notably higher community participation. For example, projects focused on planting neighborhood butterfly gardens or hosting youth community dinners were popular and experienced high turnout. These projects contribute to capacity building and community building in ways that are perhaps more fun and less daunting. The CHARP team and steering committee concluded that the safety audit process should perhaps be revisited after more “lighthearted” projects that engage new faces are implemented to build capacity for future work that requires more “heavy lifting”. This is an important conclusion, as it acknowledges that wider participation is needed to add more depth to audit findings and to ensure that ample capacity exists for post-audit implementation.

Other challenges, such as limited time and group dynamics, clearly influenced participation. Challenges not directly tied to participation, included skepticism of the project held by police and City staff. Their support and direct involvement at some point in the project may have further legitimized the project for some residents. Lack of involvement from City staff made it more difficult to utilize the community center as much as needed. It is uncertain how the absence of these challenges might impact audit findings.

3.7 Safety Audit Implementation Outline

As displayed in this guide, the safety audit tool can be customized to fit the needs of each community. The ideal safety audit tool is likely to be unique for each community. However, for communities and/or community-institution partners that wish to implement their own NSA, there are some general steps that can be followed to develop a locally relevant audit tool and process. These steps are outlined in Figure 8. These steps are a combination of actions taken in
this research project and actions team would take if this process were to be undertaken again.
Planning

1. Get a holistic view of your neighborhood through historical records, neighborhood interviews or oral histories, quality of life indicators, city staff input, etc.

2. Introduce the concept to the community at large in a relaxed forum (i.e. community listening session or meeting)

3. Set short, medium and long term goals

4. Develop a core planning team

Audit

5. Review existing safety audit tools as a community. Provide examples of each and solicit feedback.

6. Identify gaps in existing tools and adjust accordingly

7. Recruit participants throughout. Collaboratively determine an audit timeline.

8. Conduct the audit

Action

9. Analyze audit findings into themes

10. Get feedback from the entire community on audit findings to identify gaps

11. Develop action teams to translate findings into actions

12. Develop shared index of resources

13. Identify key partners to support implementation plans

Figure 8: Audit Steps
4. Community Resources

Following the focus group, CHARP researchers spent time compiling resource information for each concern category to provide a foundation of information residents could use to take action on small, short-term issues that can be tackled in the short term. It is the hope of residents and CHARP researchers that if subcommittees, with the support of CHARP researchers, can carry out several “quick wins” in a reasonable amount of time, other residents will be motivated to become engaged (Phillips & Splansky Juster, 2014). It is the goal of this section to provide a database of information to jumpstart action. This section can also serve as an example to others about what kinds of information to collect immediately post-audit.

Residents decided to focus on four subcommittees initially. These include: environment, housing, transportation, and crime. It is planned that these subcommittees will be organized in phases, with residents selecting one subcommittee to “staff” first, before moving on to others.

The following pages provide a conceptual outline of each committee that can be used by neighborhood residents as a starting point. However, these subcommittees will be shaped by those who join them, and will evolve over time. A resource list with contact information is included in the appendix.
4.1 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee

**Assets**
- Greenway Access
- Access to I-85
- Bus Routes

**Challenges**
- Infrastructure in poor condition, including sidewalks and roads
  - Speeding
- Lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities

**Project Ideas**
- Measure response times for infrastructure repairs
- Compare bus headways with buses in similar neighborhoods
- Monitor and document speeding

**Key Contacts**
- Charlotte Department of Transportation
4.2 Environment Subcommittee

**Assets**
- Greenway Access
- Community Parks and Open Space
- Creeks
- Old age trees

**Challenges**
- Flooding areas
- Hazardous Waste Sites
- Illegal garbage dumping

**Project Ideas**
- Evaluate land uses to identify environmental justice issues
- Beautification
- Educational outreach

**Key Contacts**
- EPA
- NCDNR
- Sustain Charlotte
4.3 Police Relations and Crime Subcommittee

Assets

- Project Safe Program in Place
- Community Officers

Challenges

- Turnover of Community Officers
- Negative perception of neighborhood
- Flow of crime from other areas into Enderly Park

Project Ideas

- Develop alternative youth programs
- Build relationships with neighbors
- Dismantling Racism Training

Key Contacts

- Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department
- Juvenile Justice Center
- Charlotte School of Law
4.4 Housing Subcommittee

**Assets**
- Ample supply of affordable housing
- Diverse housing types
- Mix of renters and owners

**Challenges**
- Threat of gentrification
- Several vacant homes
  - Absentee Landlords
  - Maintenance needs

**Project Ideas**
- Letter campaigns to absent landlords
- Welcome new neighbor program
- Animal welfare monitoring
- Host repair trainings and maintenance workshops

**Key Contacts**
- Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership
- Neighborhood and Business Services/Code Enforcement
- QC Family Tree
- CPCC, Lowes, Home Depot
4.5 Recruitment

In order to be successful each subcommittee will need to recruit participants and supporters. The selection of an appropriate recruitment method will maximize the committee's effectiveness in recruiting new participants. A combination of techniques is a useful strategy. Residents and CHARP researchers agree that recruitment is crucial in order for the audit to progress in a meaningful way.

Key Principles

- Define roles
- Accept all kinds of participation
- Make visible changes
- Make room for all voices
- Establish good group dynamics
- Set realistic goals and adapt strategy as needed

Recruitment Methods

- Newsletter
- Social Media
- Door-to-Door
- Block Captains
- Youth Driven Recruitment
- Snowballing
- Issue based recruitment
- Location based recruitment
5. Conclusion

A key strength of the WSA tool is its adaptability. The unique history and neighborhood dynamics of Enderly Park informed the final draft of the tool. This document describes the process used to plan, recruit, and customize the safety audit tool for the local context. Relationship building activities, participatory mapping, and reflection were key strategies used in this project.

The safety audit process in the Enderly Park neighborhood helped inform neighborhood priorities and highlighted strong neighborhood attachment. The audit identified neighborhood challenges and assets in key areas of transportation, housing, environment, and safety. Now that data has been collected on existing conditions, several resources are laid out to provide information for residents to begin to leverage assets and tackle challenges.
Examples of participatory maps created. Several iterations of maps were created as the group continued to reflect on data collected and resident feedback.
The Greater Enderly Park Neighborhood is trying to shine a light on important safety issues in the neighborhood. The first step in this process is to understand exactly what kind of safety concerns exist in the area, and get them well documented. In order to this, the neighborhood association is in the process of planning to conduct a women’s safety audit. A women’s safety audit is a tool designed to empower women to critically analyze their surroundings and identify areas and policies in need of change. Through this process residents are able to engage with municipal authorities and other community institutions in the neighborhood to document safety concerns and understand why they make the neighborhood unsafe. Issues such as crime, maintenance, traffic, or lighting are all topics that can be addressed during a safety audit. This process has the ability to address some issues immediately, and also facilitate long term planning for sustained change. Women’s safety audits are not successful without local residents, as they are the experts regarding their own neighborhood.

Saturday
SEPTEMBER 27th
9:00 AM
BETTE RAE THOMAS
COMMUNITY CENTER

Safety for women and children is safety for all!

For questions, or to get involved: Contact CHARP office at 704-687-1310
Greater Enderly Park Volunteer Pledge Sheet

NAME________________________________________________________

ADDRESS_____________________________________________________

PHONE___________________________________

EMAIL____________________________________

I prefer to be reached by (circle all that apply): PHONE EMAIL MAIL IN-PERSON

I am interested in (Circle all that apply)

Neighborhood beautification crime watch animal welfare housing rehab

General civic/community protection event organization environmental protection

Welcome committee gardening cooking youth activities

General organization duties recruitment newsletter/social media

Transit/trails outdoors OTHER:______________________________

I AM AVAILABLE FOR _______ HRS/WEEK:
(doesn’t matter if you are available for 10 mins or 10 hours, we need you!)

These days work best: (circle all that apply)

MONDAY TUESDAY WEDNESDAY THURSDAY FRIDAY SATURDAY SUNDAY
Enderly Park Call-a-Thon

Please call for more information or to RSVP....

September 11th 2014
6:00pm-8:00pm
UNCC Center City Bldg.
320 E. 9th St.

CHARP Office Phone
704-687-1310
Call-a-Thon Script

Resident name: __________________________________________________________

Resident address: ________________________________________________________

Resident phone number: ________________________________________________

Resident email: _________________________________________________________

Hi ___________________________________________________________________

My name is _______________________ and I am also a resident in the Greater Enderly Park area. I have been given your name as someone who might be interested in joining a project to improve safety in the neighborhood. We will be holding an event on Saturday September 27 where we will walk through the neighborhood as groups to identify areas that need improvement. Would you be interested in helping us improve safety in the Greater Enderly Park area or do you have any questions?

(if yes) Great! Could I get some information from you to help us stay in contact leading up to the event?

(If no) Thank you for your time. Is it ok to use this number to contact you in the future about other events?
Confirm information

Is this the best number to reach you at or is there one that is better?

___________________________________________________________

Can I confirm that your email address is

___________________________________________________________

Can I confirm that that you live at

___________________________________________________________

Is there anyone else that you know who might like to be contacted about the event? Do you have their phone number?

___________________________________________________________

Closing

Thank you again for your time and interest in helping to make the Greater Enderly Park area a safer place to live and work. Have a nice evening!
C. Audit Tool

WOMEN’S SAFETY AUDIT TOOL

RESIDENTS:____________________________________________________

MODERATOR:__________________________________________________

NEAREST INTERSECTION:________________________________________

(Please include an address, business name, or any other information needed to fully understand the reflections when appropriate)

PHOTOS TAKEN? (Circle One)        YES           NO

Reflections

(Please be sure to identify it is a positive or negative reflection, and try to answer the question of “why does this resident feel safe or unsafe in this area?” Did something happen in this area in the past? Are there positive or negative memories associated with this place?”)
D. Focus Group Questions

1. Have you observed any changes in your relationships with other residents since participating in the Women’s Safety Audit?
2. Have you observed any changes in your relationships with neighborhood organizations or city departments since participating in the Women’s Safety Audit?
3. Can you identify any changes in the way that your neighborhood association has functioned since the Women’s Safety Audit?
4. Are decisions made and actions implemented differently than before the group participated in the Women’s Safety Audit? How so?
5. What are some of the major problems that you see evident in your neighborhood?
6. What do you think are the causes of these problems?
7. Do you understand these issues differently than before participating in the Women’s Safety Audit?
8. Has the Women’s Safety Audit allowed you to address these issues? How so?
9. Are you reacting differently to these issues than before your participation in the Women’s Safety Audit?
10. How has your involvement in the Women’s Safety Audit altered your feelings of self-worth, self-respect, and empowerment? How do you view yourself after being engaged in the process? How do you see your neighborhood after being involved in the audit?
11. (for non-resident participants) Can you identify any changes in the way you interact with neighborhood residents since your involvement with the Women’s Safety Audit?
E. Resource Contact List

Recruitment
- Neighborhood Activity Ideas: [http://neighborhoodday.org/](http://neighborhoodday.org/)
- Organizing Toolkit:
- Neighborhood Association Toolkit:

Transportation and Infrastructure
- Sidewalk Related Concerns: Sonji Mosley (704)-336-3214 and Sam Barber (704)-336-4721
- Charlotte DOT Field Service Coordinators: Chip Gallup, (704) 336-3922 and Terry VonCannon, (704) 336-6786

Environment
- EPA NC District 4: (404) 562-9900

Safety
- NC Crime Stoppers: (704)-334-1600
- Neighborhood Watch:
- Rape Agression Defense: (704)-378-1403, ext.1004 OR (704)-687-8300
- NC Safety Programs: (954)-907-7587
- CMPD Workshops:
  [http://charmecrk.org/city/charlotte/CMPD/organization/Administrative/PoliceTrainingAcademy/Pages/Citizens%20Academy.aspx](http://charmecrk.org/city/charlotte/CMPD/organization/Administrative/PoliceTrainingAcademy/Pages/Citizens%20Academy.aspx)
- Anti-Defamation League and Anti-Bias Training:
- Charlotte School of Law: Pro-bono legal counseling,
- Civil Rights Clinic ([http://cslcivilrights.com/contactus/](http://cslcivilrights.com/contactus/))

Housing
- Emergency Rental Assistance:
• Habitat for Humanity Critical Home Repair:
  http://www.habitatcharlotte.org/home-ownership-home-repair/critical-home-repair
F. Standard Women’s Safety Audit Tool

Women’s safety Audit tool

1. General information
Location:
………………………………………………………………………………………….
Date:
………………………………………………………………………………………….
Time (beginning/ end):
………………………………………………………………………………………….
Audit group members:
………………………………………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………….

2. Overall Impression
How would you generally rate the location?
very safe □ fairly safe □ not safe □ scary □

List five words that best describe the location.
………………………………………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………….

3. Lighting
First impression of lighting:
very good □ good □ satisfactory □ poor □ very poor □ too dark □ too bright □

What proportion of lights is out?
……………………………………………………………………………………….
Are you able to identify a face 25 yards away?
yes □ no □

Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes or other obstructions?
yes □ no □

How well does the lighting illuminate pedestrian walkways and sidewalks?
very well □ well □ satisfactorily □ poorly □ very poorly □

How clearly does the lighting illuminate doorways, directional signs or maps?
very well □ well □ satisfactorily □ poorly □ very poorly □

How would you generally rate the lighting scheme?
very safe □ fairly safe □ not safe □ scary □

Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
4. Signage
First impression of signage:
very good □ good □ satisfactory □ poor □ very poor □
Is there a sign (i.e. room no., building name) identifying where you are?
yes □ no □
If no, are there directional signs or maps nearby which can help you identify where you are?
yes □ no □
Are there signs which show you where to get emergency assistance if needed?
yes □ no □
Are there clearly defined entrance and exit doors?
yes □ no □
If you weren’t familiar with the place, would it be easy to find your way around?
yes □ no □
How would you generally rate the signage scheme?
very safe □ fairly safe □ not safe □
Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
...........................................................................................................................
6. Isolation - Eye Distance
At the time of your audit, does the area feel isolated?
yes □ no □

How many people are likely to be around?
In the early morning: many □ several □ a few □ none □
During the day: many □ several □ a few □ none □
In the evening: many □ several □ a few □ none □
Late at night (after 10 p.m.): many □ several □ a few □ none □

What is your overall impression regarding isolation – eye distance?
very safe □ fairly safe □
not safe □
scary □

Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

7. Isolation - Ear Distance
If you call for help, would someone hear you?
yes □ no □

Is there excessive noise that would interfere with your shouting?
yes □ no □

Could you hear someone approaching?
yes □ no □

Is there somewhere you could ask for help if you feel unsafe?
yes □ no □

Is the area patrolled?
yes □ no □ don’t know □

If yes, how frequently?
every hour □ once per afternoon/evening □ don’t know □

What is positive about the location?
........................................................................................................................................................................

What is your overall impression regarding isolation – ear distance?
very safe □ fairly safe □ not safe □ scary □

Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

8. Movement Predictors (a predictable or unchangeable route or path)
Is it to predict a woman’s movements (e.g. her route)?
yes □ no □
Is there an alternative well-lit and frequently travelled route or path available?
yes □ no □ don't know □
Can you tell what is at the other end of the path, tunnel, or walkway?
yes □ no □
Are there corners, alcoves, or bushes where someone could hide and wait for you?
yes □ no □
Are there corners, alcoves, or bushes where someone could bring you to isolate you?
yes □ no □
Are there areas which should be barricaded, enclosed, locked and which are not currently?
(abandoned/ unfinished building, vacant lot, etc.)? Please precise.
..........................................................................................................................................
What is your overall impression regarding movement predictors?
very safe □ fairly safe □ not safe □ scary □
Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................

9. Escape Routes
How easy would it be for an offender to disappear?
very easy □ quite easy □ not very easy □
Is there more than one exit?
yes □ no □ don't know □
Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................

10. Overall Design
First impression of overall design:
very good □ good □ satisfactory □ poor □ very poor □
In your opinion, is this a user-friendly place?
yes □ no □
If no, why? ........................................................................................................................
In your opinion, is this a mother-friendly place?
yes □ no □
If no, why? ........................................................................................................................
Would other materials, tones, textures or colors improve your sense of safety?
yes □ no □
If yes, which ones?
..........................................................................................................................................
Should additional urban facilities be planned to improve your comfort and sense of safety?
yes □ no □
If yes, which ones?
..........................................................................................................................................
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What is positive about the location?
........................................................................................................

Main problems, recommendations & corrective measures
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

11. Priority improvements
Among all recommendations and corrective measures you suggested improving the situation, which ones are priorities?
G. References


