

previously cited, demonstrates the critical importance of good communications with the entire target population.

There is need for better evaluation of the effectiveness of the various competing antipoverty programs. The agency itself is now seeking ways to make this evaluation.

Relations between the Commission and the Cincinnati city government could be improved. Elected officials, with some exceptions, have not been supporters of the programs. Many of the difficulties, however, clearly stem from the fact that the city government is dominated by conservative political elements who are suspicious both of Federal programs and of government activities in social welfare.

Close cooperation has not developed with certain state and local government social agencies. Since these agencies are ultimately responsible to elected government, some of the political problems mentioned in the preceding comment apply here also. The situation is further complicated by the reported weakness of some of the agencies in question.

While approximately 2 out of 3 CAC staff positions have been filled by target population persons who work as nonprofessionals, the training and upgrading programs are not well developed. A major goal of CAC has been to work with the existing social welfare agencies in ways which will bring about much needed changes of the agencies without losing their cooperation. This "tightrope walking" goal has been only partially achieved. The CAP staff's philosophy—"we want to work with as many of the agencies as we can"—helped considerably. So did the ability and willingness of the Community Chest and Council to work out a blueprint for CAP activities which could become its accepted mandate. A CAC policy which encourages purchases of agency executives' time and maximizes program delegation has also been a helpful factor. But inevitable problems occur with increasing frequency as CAC's budget is reduced and choices must be made which impinge upon the agencies' interests.

INTRODUCTION

This document is one of nine city reports submitted in conjunction with the report entitled "Detailed Findings of Study to Determine Effects of CAP Programs on Selected Communities and Their Low-Income Residents." The main body of the report which summarizes the data for all nine cities was presented to the Office of Economic Opportunity in March, 1967.

The data in this report on the Cincinnati Community Action Program (including Hamilton and Clermont Counties in Ohio, and Boone, Campbell and Kenton Counties in Kentucky) is based on interviews with members of the CAA staff, community leaders and more than 600 families living in areas contiguous to the Neighborhood Centers. The community leaders include elected officials, educators, public welfare and housing officials, executives of private social welfare organizations, labor leaders, members of the press, civil rights leaders and businessmen. For a detailed description of the methodology of this report, the reader is referred to Page 218 of the summary report mentioned above.

It should be noted that the interviews with members of the CAA staff were designed to provide basic factual data on CAA operations in the Cincinnati area. Interviews with community leaders and families have been utilized to evaluate and measure the impact and achievements of CAP programs.

Detailed statistical data on Cincinnati, as well as the other cities included in this report, may be found in Part IV of the summary report entitled "Statistical Reports From OEO CAP's and Communities," also submitted in March, 1967.

DESCRIPTIVE DATA

The community

The area covered by the Community Action Commission of the Greater Cincinnati Area falls into three divisions. By far the largest is Hamilton County, Ohio, of which the city of Cincinnati forms the major part. The city has a population of 499,500; the rest of the county has 437,200 more. Negroes compose 14.3 percent of the total county population. There are 285,400 households in Hamilton County, and it is estimated that 16.5 percent of these have incomes below \$2,500 per year, with 28.7 percent below \$4,000.

In 1960, Hamilton County had an unemployment rate of 4.9 percent, somewhat lower than the national rate of 5.6 percent. This rate was higher than 53 percent of the counties in the United States. These statistics reveal, in summary, that the poverty problems of this area are not as acute or extensive as those found in some of the other communities studied.