SUMMARY REPORT

DOWNTOWN HAZLETON FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

August 13, 1997

prepared for

The Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce

prepared by

The Pennsylvania Downtown Center

PA Downtown Center . . . Services and Resources for Downtown Vitality

1230 North Third Street • Harrisburg, PA 17102-2020 • (717) 233-4675 • FAX (717) 233-4690

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The Hazleton Downtown Focus Group sessions were held in August 1997 by the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce to encourage input about the status of center-city Hazleton. Twenty-eight participants attended, representing all sectors of the downtown community.

Participants expressed optimism and great sentiment for Hazleton, the downtown area, and the City as a whole. The tone was upbeat and positive; seeking solutions and steps for the future. This says a great deal about the character of the community and its potential to succeed with a revitalization effort.

The top five issues for downtown Hazleton identified by the participants are:

1. Need for **planning**
2. Need for **partnerships** and a supportive **political climate**
3. Need for an **image** and marketing program
4. Need for a downtown **market assessment**
5. Need to save the **Northeastern Building**

Introduction

The Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce and its Downtown Committee contacted the Center for Rural Pennsylvania with concerns about downtown Hazleton. The Center for Rural Pennsylvania, a legislative agency of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, connected the Chamber of Commerce with the Pennsylvania Downtown Center, the statewide not-for-profit providing services and resources for downtown vitality.

The Chamber convened two focus groups on Monday, August 13, 1997, in the Community Room of the CAN DO Building. The session aimed to gather input about attitudes and opinions about downtown Hazleton held by business people with a vested interest in center-city. The information collected through these meetings will be used by the Chamber's Downtown Committee to help develop a strategy, and will be shared with local officials to assist in planning for the downtown.

Sessions were held from 3 until 5 p.m. and from 6 until 8 p.m. to allow flexibility for the participants. All Chamber members were invited. Twenty-six (26) participated in the two sessions, eighteen (18) in the afternoon, eight (8) in the evening, representing retail, service, non-profit, business, banking and investment, and utilities. Chamber of Commerce representatives introduced the facilitators and excused themselves.

The focus groups were conducted by Mary Joan Kevlin, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Downtown Center, and Jonathan Johnson, Senior Policy Analyst for the Center for Rural Pennsylvania. Results were tallied and compiled by Bridgett Welsh, Assistant to the Director of the Pennsylvania Downtown Center.

The results are intended for the use of the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, downtown stakeholders and local officials and leaders as a first step in developing a strategy for center-city Hazleton. Subsequent steps should address (1) development of a strategic action plan, (2) determining leadership and implementing responsibilities, and (3) organizing for implementation.

Methodology

Focus groups participated in a modified SWOT analysis, a tool to analyze "Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Strengths." The process was modified to include an initial question requiring each individual to identify his/her number one reason for attending the session. This served as an ice-breaker and encouraged initial involvement and investment in the session. It also provided an initial understanding of attendees' concerns and provided a topical benchmark for participants' SWOT analysis.

Next, in open discussion, participants identified and listed downtown strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Facilitators recorded items on flip charts and taped those lists on walls around the room for ready reference. Definitions of terms (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) were not provided to participants, but left to their own interpretation. Responses conformed to the following definitions:

STRENGTHS:	**Identify positive aspects, attributes, resources and characteristics, contributing to vigor of center-city Hazleton.**
WEAKNESSES:	**Identify downtown deficiencies, inadequacies, dissatisfactions or problems for center-city Hazleton.**
OPPORTUNITIES:	**Identify timely goals and efforts, both suitable to and meeting the demands and needs of center-city Hazleton and the community-at-large.**
THREATS:	**Indications of warning of potential problems for or damage to center-city Hazleton. Also hindrances or obstacles to maximizing strengths and opportunities, and overcoming weaknesses.**

After an hour of group discussion, participants reviewed the SWOT lists. Facilitators referred them to the initial list of #1 reasons for attending the session and asked if those concerns had been met. There were no additions to the lists from either team. Each participant was given sixteen (16) colored dot stickers (blue for the afternoon session, green for the evening) and allowed four votes for their top priorities (approximately the top 20%) within each SWOT category. While four stickers were allotted to each category, participants were permitted to vote more than one time for a particular item -- either placing votes for four individual items, or four votes for a single item, or some combination. Attendees then reviewed their voting and noted the priorities identified.

Before leaving, each participant was asked to write his or her recommendation for the next step in the process on an index card and place it in an envelope.

The sessions were upbeat, reflecting concern, commitment, and affection for downtown Hazleton. There is a willingness to act, participate, and move forward.

Results, tallies, and analysis follow.

Results & Analysis

Complete SWOT lists prepared by the focus group members are included in an appendix to this report. Those include

1. List of the participants' #1 reason for attending the focus session
2. Green and Blue team lists of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to center-city Hazleton, with team voting tallies
3. List of individual's recommendations for next steps

The SWOT process is open, inclusive and encourages brainstorming and debate, and results in identifications of points of consensus.

#1 Reason for Attending Session

The priority reasons for attending the sessions were

1. Interest in improving/revitalizing downtown Hazleton
2. Identifying markets for downtown Hazleton
3. Protecting and encouraging investment in downtown Hazleton
4. Improving the City's image

STRENGTHS

Both green and blue teams identified the following downtown strengths:

1. Commitment, willing committed people, teamwork
2. Convenient locations
3. Strong financial presence -- banks, brokerages
4. Good foundation of retail and service
5. Width of Broad Street

A lack of crime was indicated as a strength but there was a concern that perception of crime as a problem posed a threat that should not be ignored.

Top Votes:

Green team (afternoon session):

12 votes	Convenient location
7	Center of cultural institutions
6	Good utilities, power, telecommunications
6	Safe
6	Broad Street

Blue team (evening session):

7	Commitment, teamwork
4	Financial institutions
3	Tradition, longevity
3	Personal service
3	Central location

Discussion:

Top strengths identified by both groups indicate a strong sense that center-city Hazleton is viable. It maintains a varied base in retail and service sectors and participants are willing to work together toward common goals. Feeling is upbeat, committed; tone positive.

WEAKNESSES

Both teams identified the following downtown weaknesses:

1. Parking
2. Image, perception
3. Lack of white-collar jobs
4. Dilapidated buildings, derelict storefronts
5. Politics, lack of government support and interest
6. An "island mentality," feeling of a city isolated amidst sprawl and municipalities "apathetic" toward plight of the City

Top Votes:

Green team:

12 votes	Lack of local government support
11	Mercantile tax
11	No anchor department store; cluster of specialty shops; loss of movie theater, bowling, related activities
6	Lack of greenspace

Blue team:

5	Lack of marketing the downtown and key development sites (Altamont Hotel, Northeastern Building)
4	Lack of code enforcement (maintenance issues), unsafe buildings
4	Lack of parking (both free and off street)
4	Lack of white collar jobs
3	Public perception ("nothing downtown")
3	Need for government offices (state, federal)

Discussion:

Major weaknesses identified indicate an awareness of the City's role in the larger regional economy and a particular awareness of the decline of the City (both physically and as the center of community life.) There was general acknowledgment that these problems are inherent to cities in general and cities this size.

There is recognition among all parties that there are issues specific to Hazleton City government that must be addressed locally -- snow removal, code and health enforcement.

Items identified also reflected lack of a unique Hazleton focus or identifiable image or attraction (e.g. Philadelphia and Independence Hall, Pittsburgh and its Downtown Triangle, Lancaster and the Amish).

Discussion reflected a loss of a unique market for downtown Hazleton, either local or regional, even though local businesses remain competitive in the face of strip development. While dilapidated buildings were a concern, there was no discussion concerning the number of storefront vacancies in the downtown or of any goal need to concentrate retail activity. This business clustering would provide higher visibility to individual stores and add to customers image of downtown's range and mix of merchandise.

While lack of local government interest was mentioned repeatedly, only one participant mentioned any direct role for businesses and property owners. This is the private sector group which, along with the City, should be in the forefront of revitalizing downtown. Downtown businesses and property owners should redefine their role to become a downtown revitalization organization and **increase participation**. To be effective in revitalizing downtown, the group's efforts should include: (1) marketing the downtown as a place to locate a business and as a place to invest; (2) coordinating and assisting the revitalization efforts of the City and private individuals; (3) developing and implementing and overall image campaign for the downtown; (4) and assume a management role for the central business district.

mngt. entity / full time director

OPPORTUNITIES

Both teams identified the following opportunities for center-city Hazleton:

1. More promotions -- events like FunFest, keyed to sales, contests, and give-aways
2. Farmers' markets, antiques

Top Votes:

Green team:

12 votes	Space for recreation * indoor -- go-carts, racing, golf * outdoor -- for public gatherings.
8	Mine lands an opportunity -- multi-use
3	Market/sell properties to Fortune 500 company

Blue team:

8	• Northeastern Building -- possible educational use HASD * Penn State satellite * McCann School of Business
4	Greater participation
4	Become our own county
3	Group advertising

Discussion:

Opportunities for downtown Hazleton generated fewest items for discussion, indicating that stakeholders are occupied with individual business interests and may not have considered opportunities within their own market. That thirty-eight (38) strengths were identified versus twenty-four (24) opportunities suggests an appreciation of strengths that have not yet be converted into an action agenda.

Large downtown properties (Altamont Hotel, Northeastern Building) were identified as key opportunities. However, there was some expectation that a single major development project would "save" downtown. The status of the Northeastern Building (former Markle Bank Building) was a running concern throughout both sessions. It surfaced as a major issue under numerous categories (e.g. outmigration of business and **loss of downtown white collar jobs** through the **mercantile tax**, lack of support of **City government** in identifying uses and marketing the property, **"bad press"** with

Preservation Pennsylvania's designation of the property as its "Most Threatened" in its ***Pennsylvania At Risk*** statewide newsletter. This building and its future clearly is a benchmark for the direction of downtown Hazleton.

There was no identification of issues/efforts for incremental growth, even though the community has significant accomplishment in projects like the Deisroth Building (conversion of a former department store to smaller retail shops) and growth in the antiques and consignment markets. Likewise, no image-related, community-defining opportunity surfaced.

THREATS

Both teams identified the following threats for center-city Hazleton:

1. Absentee landlords
2. Lack of a short and long term plan
3. Lack of "diversity of ages," too much subsidized housing
4. Attitude and political climate, bad press

Top Votes:

Green team:

12 votes	Political climate
10	Lack of short- and long-term plan
7	Empty storefronts and lack of upkeep, both owner and municipal

Blue team:

6	Lack of action
5	Malls, strip development, sprawl
5	Parking
4	Code enforcement

Discussion:

Again, the list of threats to the downtown district was short. There was discussion that there was no single threat, but a gradual downward slide. The groups identified both threats from outside the community (landlords, market forces, sprawl) and threats internal to the community (lack of upkeep, lack of planning and marketing, and no partnership with City Hall). Isolation and continued apathy was a concern with questions raised about how to best combat the issue.

There was no mention of the lack of a role for downtown stakeholders as a threat to the downtown. Current players with a vested interest in the health of the downtown must increase their individual and collective participation in the revitalization process to met goals. Individuals should organize and assign members specialized tasks: e.g. hold and improve current promotions, develop membership and on-going financial commitment; developing a staff position with sound funding commitment; and developing partners in the revitalization effort, particularly with the City.

NEXT STEPS

At the conclusion of the two-hour session, individuals were asked to provide their recommendation for the next step in writing on an index card. Responses were collected in an envelope. Common among the recommendations were

1. Recognition that there is a problem and that the downtown needs help.
2. Of twenty-three (23) responses, thirteen (13) related directly to planning. and show a clear recognition of the need for downtown planning.
3. A sense of urgency and momentum. The groups expressed interest in carrying the process forward. Responses stressed positive attitude and partnership.
4. The Northeastern Building -- again, a recurrent theme. Comments included the desire to "halt destruction," stabilize, market the property, seek funding for rehabilitation. The building is seen as a centerpiece for downtown, a home to commercial and professional enterprise. Additional comments: "Other downtown development will depend on what happens to this building." "This property is the "aura" of Hazleton."

Discussion:

To summarize, focus group participants were clearly committed, not discouraged and expressed an underlying optimism about center-city Hazleton. They are concerned, and feel disconnected from local government, surrounding towns, and Luzerne County. They conclude that the downtown is threatened and recognize the situation. They express optimism and great sentiment for Hazleton, the downtown area, and the City as a whole.

Priorities identified (no voting or ranking here) are:

- Planning
- Partnerships
- Political climate
- Focus, image. Seeming lack of community identity
- Market analysis and marketing
- Northeastern Building

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this report was to gather and prioritize input about attitudes and opinions towards downtown Hazleton from businessmen and women with a vested interest in the center-city area. Secondarily, it was to lay the basis for further discussion within the community and assist residents, business people, and local leadership in their downtown-related planning.

To take maximum advantage of interest generated to date, the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, the City, merchants and property owners should:

- **Visit other communities** involved in the downtown redevelopment process.
- Integrate downtown questions into larger **regional community planning** and development efforts.
- Create a **downtown revitalization organization**. Secure funding for a minimum of three years. Hire staff.
- Complete a **comprehensive downtown inventory**. Identify type and quantity of space, tenant, type of construction, etc.
- Stabilize **Northeastern Building** and develop plan for its future.
- Gather additional input on downtown attitudes from a city-wide base, surrounding towns and Luzerne County to verify focus group direction. Undertake consumer **surveys** to identify targeted needs; telephone surveys of area residents (selected randomly from the Hazleton telephone book); intercept surveys of shoppers at the Laurel Mall and downtown, and surveys of downtown employees.
- Assess **parking effectiveness** by evaluating area of service.
- Complete a **market analysis** for downtown Hazleton. Analyze current demographic and market information and studies completed to date and expand research to determine current market niches and community needs.
- Develop a **strategic plan**, identifying both short and long term goals. Identify roles and responsibilities for accomplishing tasks and investigate potential funding sources.
- Develop a **business recruitment plan**, based upon market and strategic planning efforts. This will includes determining which options to pursue, obtaining necessary cooperation from property owners and financial institutions and effectively implementing the strategy.
- Develop overall **public relations/promotions strategy** for downtown to promote Hazleton as the heart of the City and region. Secure adequate funding.

APPENDIX I:

Downtown Hazleton Focus Group

August 13, 1997
3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

GREEN TEAM'S #1 REASON FOR ATTENDING

1. Input
2. Interest
3. Viability as Neighborhood
4. Possibilities
5. Alternatives
6. HUB - Regional
7. Partnerships
8. Residential - People!
9. Identify Market
10. Marketing
11. Safety
12. Parking
    - Needs
    - Management
    - Service
13. Culture
14. Children
15. Beautification
16. Activities
17. Bring People Downtown
18. Cooperation/Unity/Partnership: Government and Merchants

19. Investment
    -Tax Base: HUB

20. Street Lights (Green Arrows)

21. To Help

22. Identify Common Goals

23. Attractions

24. Enthusiasm

25. Health Care Center

26. Incorporate as New County - New County Center

27. Diverse Character: Uniqueness

28. Preservation

29. Strengthen Community Economic Development

30. Short and Long Term Plan
    -Northeastern Building
        *Keep Building Viable
        *Part of Emergency Plan
        *Preserve Office Function

GREEN TEAM'S LIST OF STRENGTHS*

		# of Votes
1.	Strong Financial Presence	2
2.	Willing People	2
3.	***Convenient Location*** ***-Good Highway Access*** ***-Population Center*** ***-Location, Location, Location*** ***-Crossroads***	***12***
4.	***Broad Street*** ***-Wide*** ***-Inviting*** ***-Clean*** ***-Trees***	***6***
5.	Looks Like a City	1
6.	Available Retail Space	5
7.	Good Base Mix (Professional and Retail)	2
8.	Convenient For Seniors (Customer Friendly)	
9.	Senior Citizen Housing	
10.	FunFest	
11.	Public Transportation	1
12.	Concentration of Specialty Stores	
13.	Government Hub	1
14.	Community Desire to Shop Downtown	
15.	***Safe - Will Remain So, No Threat***	***6***

* Top three vote-getters identified in italics.

		# of Votes
16.	Parking	
17.	Churches	
18.	Potential: LOTS!	3
19.	Good Mix of Eateries	
20.	Pizza Parlors and Bars	
21.	Social Services	
22.	*Cultural Institutions:* *-Library* *-YMCA/YWCA* *-Philharmonic* *-Historical Society* *-Art League* *-Community Concert*	*7*
23.	Hospital	
24.	*Good Utilities, Power Telecommunications*	*6*

GREEN TEAM'S LIST OF WEAKNESSES

		# of Votes
1.	*Mercantile Tax* *-Loss of Occupancy* *-Loss of Physicians*	*11*
2.	Parking -Library	2
3.	Hazleton Shopping Center Deterioration -Loss of K-Mart, McCrory's, Sears	3
4.	Lack of Community Support	1
5.	***Lack of Local Government Support***	***12***
6.	***Lack of Green Space***	***6***
7.	Loss of Major Office Centers (e.g. Northeastern Building)	4
8.	***No Hotels, Anchor Department Stores,*** ***Cluster of Specialty Shops, and Movie Theaters***	***11***
9.	Route 309 Congestion From North to South	
10.	Dismal Approach -Route 309 Bad First Impression	1
11.	Commuter Economy	
12.	Outmigration	1
13.	Geographic Isolation -Landlocked -Surrounded by Hazle Township	1
14.	Mine Lands -Idle -Ugly	
15.	Image; Perception	5

		# of Votes
16.	Lack of Pride	3
17.	Weather -Windy -Fog	
18.	Evening Hours	
19.	Railroad Tracks -Active Line -Deterrent -Removal	1
20.	Loss of Historical Ambiance	
21.	Dilapidated Buildings	1
22.	Lack of Focal Point, Gathering Point	1
23.	Lack of White Collar Jobs in City	3

GREEN TEAM'S LIST OF OPPORTUNITIES

		# of Votes
1.	*Space for Recreation* *-Buildings* *-Land*	*12*
2.	*Mine Lands* *-Multi-use*	*8*
3.	Expand Farmers Market	
4.	*Market/Sell to Fortune 500 Company*	*3*
5.	Incubators	1
6.	More Activities like FunFest and Downtown-Wide Promotions	2
7.	Lack of Age Diversity -Develop Critical Mass of Elderly to Attract Physicians, etc.	2

GREEN TEAM'S LIST OF THREATS

		# of Votes
1.	*Political Climate*	*12*
2.	Bad Press	3
3.	Aging Properties	1
4.	Absentee Landlords	1
5.	Lack of Diversity of Ages	1
6.	Lack of Tolerance -Racial Diversity -Newcomers	
7.	***Empty Storefronts*** ***-Lack of Upkeep (Snow Removal, etc.)***	***7***
8.	Lack of Regional Cooperation -No Mutual Aid	
9.	Tied-Up Leases on Vacant Properties -Weis -Northeastern	
10.	***Lack of Short and Long Term Plan***	***10***

GREEN TEAM'S NEXT STEPS

* Start with one project at a time and stick with it until it's completed, then start the next.

* Prioritize: short term and long term issues.

* Keep the momentum going with merchants meetings; involve government.

* Move ahead respectively and don't take old baggage with you, have a neutral thinking mind.

* "Agreed" - "By the yard its hard, by the inch it's a cinch"! Need to have one or two projects per time line and do well. Both short term and long term.

* Meet with elected officials, and present the findings and concerns of business people, and then try to make a plan of where we are now and where we are going.

* Work on developing a good positive community attitude - making Hazleton a place that people are proud of. A city that people want to come shop, socialize, etc.

* Make up a short and long term plan. List items under long-term which will take a long time to develop. List items under short-term which can be developed now. Choose items to begin working on immediately.

* Devise a short and long term plan for the N.E. Building.

* Develop short and long term plans.

* Take inventory of our assets (retailers and financial) and build from there. One objective.

* Restore, rehabilitate, revitalize the Markle Bank Building. Make it a centerpiece for downtown. It should be home to commercial and professional enterprises - not low-income housing.

* Concentrate on bringing in larger retail businesses (department stores, movie chains, shopping centers, etc.)

* Get government, business, and financial people to sit down and work for the good of Hazleton.

* Do some short/long term, serious planning, using a diverse group of community leaders.

* Try to save Northeastern Building - other downtown development will depend on what happens to this building.

APPENDIX II:

Downtown Hazleton Focus Group

August 13, 1997
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

BLUE TEAM'S #1 REASONS FOR ATTENDING

1. Business Investment
2. Different Ideas
3. Interest in Future
4. City Image
5. Pride
6. Joint Promotion
7. Bustle
8. Develop Local Market
9. Develop Reason to Come Downtown

BLUE TEAM'S LIST OF STRENGTHS

		# of Votes
1.	***Commitment/Good People/Team Work***	*7*
2.	***Central Location***	*3*
3.	Time Capsule: - Memories - Local Identity - Architecture - Texture - Different from Mall - Intimate	2
4.	***Tradition/Longevity***	*3*
5.	***Personal Service***	*3*
6.	More selective buying: "Different"	1
7.	Investment	
8.	Economics of Downtown Location	1
9.	High Retail and Service Activity	
10.	Width of Broad Street	1
11.	***Banks***	*4*
12.	FunFest	
13.	Local Newspaper	2
14.	Southwest Beltway - Removal of Truck Traffic	

<u>BLUE TEAM'S LIST OF WEAKNESSES</u>

		# of votes
1.	*Code Enforcement (maintenance; unsafe buildings)*	*4*
2.	Health Enforcement - "Smell"	
3.	City Government -Lack of Interest -Partiality -Piecemeal Effort -Services: snow removal	
4.	*Lack of Parking* *-Free* *-Off Street*	*4*
5.	Fear - assault/crime	1
6.	*Public Perception: "Nothing Downtown"*	*3*
7.	Absentee/Negligent Landlords	
8.	Lack of Business Training	
9.	FunFest -Building Damage -Cost to Participate in Promotions -No Immediate Sales Benefit	
10.	*Lack of White Collar Jobs in the Downtown*	*4*
11.	*Lack of Marketing the Downtown (like individual parks):* *-Altamont* *-Northeastern Building*	*5*
12.	Local News Agencies	
13.	"Island Surrounded" - Hazle Township	
14.	Held Hostage by Local Developer	
15.	Derelict Storefronts	1

		# of Votes
16.	Services: -Snow Removal -Bank Obstacles	
17.	Local News Agencies Cost of Advertising	
18.	***Need for Presence of County Government (Federal/County Offices)***	*3*
19.	Politics	1

BLUE TEAM'S LIST OF OPPORTUNITIES

		# of Votes
1.	*Group Advertising*	*3*
2.	Night Hours	
3.	More Promotions - "Free" Prizes	1
4.	More Community Sessions	2
5.	Snow Removal - An Evening to Clear All of Broad Street	
6.	Links with Legislators	
7.	*Greater Participation: Downtown and/or Hazleton Merchants Group*	*4*
8.	State/Federal Business Program Funding	1
9.	Save/Preserve Downtown and Historic Buildings	
10.	Antique Market with Farmers Market or: -Antiques Center -Resale/Consignment Shops -New Children's, Shoes, Lingerie shops	1
11.	Explore Grants and Incentives	1
12.	*Northeastern Building* *-Educational Use (e.g. McCann's School of Business, Penn State, Luzerne County Community College, etc.)*	*8*
13.	Marketing	1
14.	Manufacturer's Outlets	
15.	Urban Flight - Business Relocation	
16.	*Become our Own County*	*4*
17.	Leadership	1

BLUE TEAM'S LIST OF THREATS

		# of Votes
1.	Attitude	2
2.	Out-of-Town Landlords (NJ, NY, Philadelphia)	1
3.	*Code Enforcement*	*4*
4.	Slum Lords/Excessive Occupancy	
5.	Continued Apathy	2
6.	NJ/Philadelphia Transients -Community -Economic Opportunity -Advertising	
7.	Southwest Beltway - Removal of All Traffic	2
8.	*Malls/Strip/Sprawl*	*5*
9.	*Parking*	*5*
10.	Lack of Convenience - Diversity of Shopping Experience	1
11.	Too Much Subsidized Housing -Low Income -Senior Citizen	
12.	Mergers and Consolidation Banks	3
13.	*Lack of Action Now!*	*6*

BLUE TEAM'S NEXT STEPS

* Our group made the first commitment - We Need Help! We Want Help! We shall stay in Hazleton! We are very proud of our town and will work together to make shopping and living a delightful experience.

* Mobilization of Chamber/City Government in regard to downtown issues. Make Markle Bank Building (Northeastern) home to major corporation employing well paid white collar college educated workers. Development of cohesive downtown group designed to troubleshoot issues, etc.

* Continued exploration of the opportunities that exist in downtown Hazleton and the methods to help these opportunities to be realized.

* Would like to see downtown the way it was years ago (lot more parking, lot more people, and lots of new business)!

* Community support, government support - major factors for the future and development of our city.

* Action taken to halt any destruction of the N.E. Building. Seek some funding and multi-use of the building. Recapture the vacant building and restore the aura of a thriving community.

* Would like to see downtown Hazleton grow more, more group meetings for this to happen.

APPENDIX III:

Hazleton City Demographic Profile

and

Hazleton City Business Profile

Provided by the Center for Rural Pennsylvania,
a Legislative Agency of the Pennsylvania General Assembly

HAZLETON CITY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

CENTER FOR RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 604, HARRISBURG, PA 17101 (717) 787-9555

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
POPULATION			
Population, 1950	10,415,706	392,243	35,491
Population, 1960	11,248,665	346,974	32,056
Population, 1970	11,766,412	331,404	30,426
Population, 1980	11,864,720	343,079	27,318
Population, 1990	11,881,643	328,149	24,730
Population, 1991 (est)	11,947,118	329,284	24,897
Population, 1992 (est)	11,990,036	329,475	25,115
Population, 1993 (est)	12,030,230	329,144	24,897
Population, 1994 (est)	12,052,429	327,728	24,664
Population, 1995 (est)	12,071,931	326,077	24,543
AREA			
Area, Sq. Miles	45,064.7	889.2	5.9
Population Per Sq. Mile, 1990	263.7	369.0	4,191.5
MIGRATION			
# Persons 5 Years Old & Older, 1990	11,085,170	308,977	23,321
% Who Lived in the Same House in 1985	63.4%	69.3%	69.5%
% Who Lived in Different House, But Same County, 1985	22.1%	20.8%	21.1%
% Who Lived in Different County, But Same State, 1985	7.4%	4.9%	5.0%
% Who Lived in Different State or Abroad in 1985	7.2%	5.1%	4.4%
AGE COHORTS			
# Persons Under 18 Years Old, 1990	2,794,810	70,184	4,917
% Population Under 18 Years Old, 1990	23.5%	21.4%	19.9%
% Change in # Persons Under 18 Years Old, 1980-90	-10.6%	-16.0%	-17.3%
# Persons Between 18-64 Years Old, 1990	7,257,727	193,248	13,893
% Persons Between 18-64 Years Old, 1990	61.1%	58.9%	56.2%
% Change in # Persons Between 18-64 Years Old, 1980-90	0.7%	-5.0%	-12.6%
# Persons Over 65 Years Old, 1990	1,829,106	64,717	5,920
% Persons Over 65 Years Old, 1990	15.4%	19.7%	23.9%
% Change in # Persons Over 65 Years Old, 1980-90	19.5%	15.3%	8.0%
BABY BOOMERS			
# Baby Boomers, 1990 (1)	3,657,323	92,461	6,420
% Population Who are Baby Boomers, 1990	30.8%	28.2%	26.0%
% Change in # Baby Boomers, 1980-90	-7.1%	-9.1%	-15.1%
FAMILIES / HOUSEHOLDS			
# Families, 1990 (2)	3,155,989	88,412	6,739
% Change in # Families, 1980-90	0.7%	-4.9%	-11.1%
# Households, 1990 (3)	4,495,966	128,483	10,574
% Change in # Households, 1980-90	6.5%	2.4%	-1.7%

HAZLETON CITY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

CENTER FOR RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 604, HARRISBURG, PA 17101 (717) 787-9555

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
TYPES OF HOUSEHOLDS			
# Households, 1990	4,495,966	128,483	10,574
% Married Couples without Children	30.5%	30.4%	28.9%
% Married Couples with Children	25.2%	23.2%	18.2%
% Male Headed Households	3.3%	3.4%	3.7%
% Female Headed Households	11.3%	11.9%	13.0%
% Single Person Households	25.6%	28.6%	33.4%
% Nonhouseholds (4)	4.2%	2.6%	2.8%
HOUSING UNITS			
# Housing Units, 1990	4,938,140	138,724	11,343
% Vacant or Unoccupied Housing Units	9.0%	7.4%	6.8%
% Homeowners (Owner-Occupied Housing Units)	64.3%	64.2%	56.2%
HOUSING VALUES			
Avg. Values of Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units, 1990	$88,027	$66,877	$53,834
Median Values of Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units, 1990	$69,700	$56,000	$43,900
% Change in Adjusted Median Housing Values, 1980-90 (5)	12.4%	14.6%	1.6%
RANGE OF HOUSING VALUES			
# Values Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units, 1990	2,581,261	72,110	5,514
% Under $29,999	13.3%	15.2%	25.4%
% Between $30,000-$49,999	18.8%	27.4%	31.9%
% Between $50,000-$74,999	22.6%	27.4%	23.6%
% Between $75,000-$99,999	16.8%	15.5%	10.6%
% Between $100,000-$149,999	15.3%	9.5%	5.8%
% Between $150,000-$199,999	7.0%	2.8%	1.8%
% Over $200,000	6.1%	2.2%	0.9%
RATE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT			
# Housing Units, 1990	4,938,140	138,724	11,343
% Units Built After 1980	12.4%	8.6%	5.0%
% Units Built Between 1970-79	15.8%	17.6%	9.4%
% Units Built Between 1960-69	12.4%	8.4%	7.5%
% Units Built Between 1950-59	14.6%	7.7%	9.5%
% Units Built Between 1940-49	9.7%	7.9%	10.4%
% Units Built Before 1939	35.1%	49.8%	58.1%
TYPES OF HOUSING UNITS			
# Housing Units, 1990	4,938,140	138,724	11,343
% Detached 1 Housing Unit (Single Family Homes)	53.4%	57.6%	34.7%
% Attached 1 Housing Unit (Duplex/Townhouse)	18.4%	13.5%	33.9%
% 2 Unit Housing (Apt.)	5.7%	7.9%	7.7%
% 3-4 Unit Housing (Apt.)	4.6%	6.6%	10.9%
% 5 Or More Housing Units (Apt.)	11.4%	8.5%	9.9%
% Mobile Homes	5.2%	4.2%	0.4%
% Other Types of Housing Units	1.3%	1.7%	2.5%

HAZLETON CITY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

CENTER FOR RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 604, HARRISBURG, PA 17101 (717) 787-9555

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
WATER / SEWAGE			
# Housing Units, 1990	4,938,140	138,724	11,343
% Units Using Public or Private Water System	78.1%	82.2%	99.4%
% Units Using Drilled Wells or Other Sources	21.9%	17.8%	0.6%
% Units Using Public Sewage Disposals	74.3%	80.3%	99.3%
% Units Using Septic Tank, Cesspool, or Other Systems	25.7%	19.7%	0.7%
POVERTY			
# Persons Living Below the Poverty Line, 1989	1,283,629	35,742	3,292
Poverty Rate, 1989	11.1%	11.2%	13.5%
# Persons Living Below the Poverty Line, 1979	1,209,815	33,369	2,626
Poverty Rate, 1979	10.5%	9.9%	9.7%
# Children Living in Households Below Poverty Line, 1989	421,750	11,051	1,171
% Children Living in Households Below Poverty Line, 1989	18.2%	19.0%	31.5%
INCOME			
Per Capita Income, 1989	$14,068	$12,002	$11,512
Median Household Income, 1989	$29,069	$23,600	$20,927
% Change in Adjusted Median Household Income, 1979-89 (6)	0.8%	-1.2%	-5.3%
RANGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
# Reporting Households, 1989	4,492,958	128,283	10,563
% Low Income Households (Under $17,499)	29.6%	38.0%	42.7%
% Lower-Middle Income Households (Between $17,500-$29,999)	21.9%	22.9%	24.7%
% Middle Income Households (Between $30,000-$42,499)	18.8%	18.1%	16.1%
% Upper-Middle Income Households (Between $42,500-$59,999)	15.3%	12.5%	9.8%
% Upper Income Households (Over $60,000)	14.4%	8.5%	6.7%
TYPES OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 1989			
Avg. Household Income from Wages or Salaries	$36,643	$31,160	$27,441
Avg. Household Income from Interest, Dividends & Rent	$5,686	$4,997	$4,519
Avg. Household Income from Social Security	$8,107	$7,491	$7,454
Avg. Household Income from Retirement	$7,615	$6,083	$5,913
Avg. Household Income From Other Sources	$3,891	$3,450	$3,975
HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED FOR PERSONS 25 YEARS OLD & OLDER			
# Persons 25 Years Old & Older, 1990	7,872,932	226,563	17,596
% With No High School Degree	25.3%	28.0%	28.3%
% With High School Degree or Equivalent	38.6%	41.0%	46.0%
% With Some College or Associate Degree	18.2%	17.9%	15.4%
% With Bachelor Degree	17.9%	13.1%	10.3%

CENTER FOR RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 604, HARRISBURG, PA 17101 (717) 787-9555

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
EMPLOYMENT BY SECTOR			
# Persons Employed 16 Years Old & Older, 1990	5,434,532	143,046	10,521
% Employed in Agriculture, Forestry, & Mining Sectors	2.4%	1.4%	1.3%
% Employed in Construction Sector	6.1%	6.0%	5.5%
% Employed in Manufacturing Sector	20.0%	22.0%	26.3%
% Employed in Communications, Utilities, & Transportation Sectors	6.9%	6.9%	6.2%
% Employed in Wholesale & Retail Trade Sectors	21.5%	23.3%	21.3%
% Employed in Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate Sectors	6.5%	5.6%	5.5%
% Employed in Service Sector	32.6%	30.4%	31.6%
% Employed in Public Administration Sector	4.0%	4.4%	2.3%
EMPLOYMENT BY JOB TYPE			
# Persons Employed 16 Years Old & Older, 1990	5,434,532	143,046	10,521
% Employed in Professional or Management Jobs	25.2%	21.1%	20.1%
% Employed in White Collar Jobs	31.7%	31.1%	29.9%
% Employed Service Jobs	13.0%	13.8%	13.4%
% Employed in Blue Collar Jobs	30.1%	33.9%	36.7%
PLACE OF WORK			
# Workers, 1990	5,348,132	140,750	10,380
Avg. Time to Work (In Minutes)	22	18	16
% Workers that Work Within the Municipality of Residence (7)	95.7%	85.2%	56.1%
% Workers that Work Outside the Municipality of Residence	4.2%	14.8%	43.9%

ALL DATA CAME FROM THE 1980 AND 1990 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, SUMMARY FILE TAPE 1A AND 3A, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU.

1. A Baby Boomer is any one born between 1946-65.
2. A family is defined as having at least two people: the householder and someone who is related by blood, marriage, or adoption.
3. A household is defined as an occupied dwelling that has its own entrance and kitchen.
4. Nonhouseholds include those persons living in an institutional setting: i.e., prisons, nursing homes, college dormitories, etc.
5. The 1980 and 1990 median values of specified owner-occupied housing units were adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index with 1982-84=1.
6. The 1979 and 1989 median household incomes were adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index with 1982-84=1.
7. The percentage reported for the state represents the number of workers who work within the state of residence. The percentage reported for the county represents the number of workers who work within the county of residence.

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS			
# Retail Establishments, 1982	64,266	1,836	220
# Retail Establishments, 1987	70,823	2,108	242
# Retail Establishments, 1992	71,652	2,045	220
% Change in Retail Establishments, 1982-87	10.2%	14.8%	10.0%
% Change in Retail Establishments, 1987-92	1.2%	-3.0%	-9.1%
SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS			
# Service Establishments, 1982	55,022	1,364	174
# Service Establishments, 1987	70,071	1,709	232
# Service Establishments, 1992	77,839	1,941	264
% Change in Service Establishments, 1982-87	27.4%	25.3%	33.3%
% Change in Service Establishments, 1987-92	11.1%	13.6%	13.8%
RETAIL & SERVICE SECTORS			
Total # Retail/Service Establishments, 1982	119,288	3,200	394
Total # Retail/Service Establishments, 1987	140,894	3,817	474
Total # Retail/Service Establishments, 1992	149,491	3,986	484
% Change in Retail/Service Establishments, 1982-87	18.1%	19.3%	20.3%
% Change in Retail/Service Establishments, 1987-92	6.1%	4.4%	2.1%
RETAIL SALES*			
Adjusted Retail Sales, ($1,000), 1982	$71,565,833	$1,861,900	$254,807
Adjusted Retail Sales, ($1,000), 1987	$87,955,015	$2,342,226	$259,874
Adjusted Retail Sales, ($1,000), 1992	$87,787,842	$2,345,715	$257,332
% Change in Adjusted Retail Sales, 1982-87	22.9%	25.8%	2.0%
% Change in Adjusted Retail Sales, 1987-92	-0.2%	0.1%	-1.0%
AVG. SALE PER RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT*			
Avg. Adjusted Retail Sale Per Establishment, 1982	$1,113,588	$1,014,107	$1,158,212
Avg. Adjusted Retail Sale Per Establishment, 1987	$1,241,899	$1,111,113	$1,073,858
Avg. Adjusted Retail Sale Per Establishment, 1992	$1,225,197	$1,147,049	$1,169,691
SERVICE SECTOR RECEIPTS*			
Adjusted Service Receipts ($1,000), 1982	$27,744,640	$448,972	$51,681
Adjusted Service Receipts ($1,000), 1987	$41,042,905	$709,778	$87,332
Adjusted Service Receipts ($1,000), 1992	$49,382,550	$925,272	$103,458
% Change in Adjusted Service Receipts, 1982-87	47.9%	58.1%	69.0%
% Change in Adjusted Service Receipts, 1987-92	20.3%	30.4%	18.5%

CENTER FOR RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 604, HARRISBURG, PA 17101 (717) 787-9555

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
AVG. RECEIPTS PER SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT*			
Avg. Adjusted Service Receipts Per Establishment, 1982	$504,246	$329,158	$297,019
Avg. Adjusted Service Receipts Per Establishment, 1987	$585,733	$415,318	$376,430
Avg. Adjusted Service Receipts Per Establishment, 1992	$634,419	$476,699	$391,886
TOTAL RETAIL/SERVICE SALES*			
Adjusted Retail/Service Sales ($1,000), 1982	$99,310,474	$2,310,872	$306,488
Adjusted Retail/Service Sales ($1,000), 1987	$128,997,920	$3,052,004	$347,205
Adjusted Retail/Service Sales ($1,000), 1992	$137,170,392	$3,270,987	$360,790
% Change in Adjusted Retail/Service Receipts, 1982-87	29.9%	32.1%	13.3%
% Change in Adjusted Retail/Service Receipts, 1987-92	6.3%	7.2%	3.9%
AVG. SALES/RECEIPTS PER ESTABLISHMENT*			
Avg. Adjusted Retail/Service Receipts Per Establishment, 1982	$832,527	$722,147	$777,888
Avg. Adjusted Retail/Service Receipts Per Establishment, 1987	$915,567	$799,582	$732,501
Avg. Adjusted Retail/Service Receipts Per Establishment, 1992	$917,583	$820,619	$745,434
MIX OF RETAIL/SERVICE SALES			
Total Retail/Service Sales, 1992	$137,170,392	$3,270,987	$360,790
% Retail Sales ($1,000), 1992	64.0%	71.7%	71.3%
% Service Receipts, ($1,000) 1992	36.0%	28.3%	28.7%
ANNUAL RETAIL PAYROLL*			
Adjusted Annual Retail Payroll, 1982 ($1,000)	$8,190,540	$205,529	$26,385
Adjusted Annual Retail Payroll, 1987 ($1,000)	$9,999,820	$250,032	$29,122
Adjusted Annual Retail Payroll, 1992 ($1,000)	$10,042,888	$263,849	$27,521
% Change in Adjusted Retail Payroll, 1982-87	22.1%	21.7%	10.4%
% Change in Adjusted Retail Payroll, 1987-92	0.4%	5.5%	-5.5%
AVG. PAYROLL PER ESTABLISHMENT*			
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Establishment, 1982	$127,447	$111,944	$119,932
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Establishment, 1987	$141,195	$118,611	$120,339
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Establishment, 1992	$140,162	$129,022	$125,095
ANNUAL SERVICE PAYROLL*			
Adjusted Annual Service Payroll ($1,000), 1982	$10,243,011	$158,112	$19,004
Adjusted Annual Service Payroll ($1,000), 1987	$15,324,101	$265,250	$37,807
Adjusted Annual Service Payroll ($1,000), 1992	$18,740,764	$324,876	$41,349
% Change in Adjusted Service Payroll, 1982-87	49.6%	67.8%	98.9%
% Change in Adjusted Service Payroll, 1987-92	22.3%	22.5%	9.4%

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
AVG. PAYROLL PER ESTABLISHMENT*			
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Service Establishment, 1982	$186,162	$115,918	$109,217
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Service Establishment, 1987	$218,694	$155,208	$162,961
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Service Establishment, 1992	$240,763	$167,376	$156,625
ANNUAL RETAIL/SERVICE PAYROLL*			
Adjusted Annual Retail/Service Payroll ($1,000), 1982	$18,433,550	$363,640	$45,389
Adjusted Annual Retail/Service Payroll ($1,000), 1987	$25,323,920	$515,281	$66,929
Adjusted Annual Retail/Service Payroll ($1,000), 1992	$28,783,652	$588,725	$68,870
% Change in Adjusted Retail/Service Payroll, 1982-87	37.4%	41.7%	47.5%
% Change in Adjusted Retail/Service Payroll, 1987-92	13.7%	14.3%	2.9%
AVG. PAYROLL PER ESTABLISHMENT*			
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Retail/Service Establishment, 1982	$154,530	$113,638	$115,200
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Retail/Service Establishment, 1987	$179,737	$134,996	$141,200
Avg. Adjusted Payroll Per Retail/Service Establishment, 1992	$192,544	$147,698	$142,293
MIX OF RETAIL/SERVICE ANNUAL PAYROLLS			
Annual Retail/Service Payroll (Actual), 1992 ($1,000)	28,783,652	588,725	68,870
% Annual Retail Payroll (Actual), 1992 ($1,000)	34.9%	44.8%	40.0%
% Annual Service Payroll (Actual), 1992 ($1,000)	65.1%	55.2%	60.0%
RETAIL EMPLOYEES			
# Paid Retail Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1982	697,826	18,760	2,566
# Paid Retail Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1987	847,907	23,663	2,802
# Paid Retail Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1992	861,565	24,421	2,615
% Change in # Paid Retail Employees, 1982-87	21.5%	26.1%	9.2%
% Change in # Paid Retail Employees, 1987-92	1.6%	3.2%	-6.7%
SERVICE EMPLOYEES			
# Paid Service Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1982	485,850	9,057	1,090
# Paid Service Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1987	693,760	14,661	1,792
# Paid Service Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1992	797,051	20,290	3,166
% Change in # Paid Service Employees, 1982-87	42.8%	61.9%	64.4%
% Change in # Paid Service Employees, 1987-92	14.9%	38.4%	76.7%

CENTER FOR RURAL PENNSYLVANIA, 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 604, HARRISBURG, PA 17101 (717) 787-9555

	PENNSYLVANIA (State Total)	LUZERNE COUNTY	HAZLETON CITY
RETAIL/SERVICE EMPLOYEES			
# Paid Retail/Service Employees, 1982	1,183,676	27,817	3,656
# Paid Retail/Service Employees, 1987	1,541,667	38,324	4,594
# Paid Retail/Service Employees, 1992	1,658,616	44,711	5,781
% Change in # Paid Retail/Service Employees, 1982-87	30.2%	37.8%	25.7%
% Change in # Paid Retail/Service Employees, 1987-92	7.6%	16.7%	25.8%
MIX OF RETAIL/SERVICE EMPLOYEES			
# Paid Retail/Service Employees, 1992	1,658,616	44,711	5,781
% Paid Retail Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1992	51.9%	54.6%	45.2%
% Paid Service Employees for Pay Period Ending March 12, 1992	48.1%	45.4%	54.8%

*Data adjusted for inflation using the CPI-U with 1992=100
Source: 1982, 1987, & 1992 Census of Retail Trade and Census of Service Industries, U.S. Census Bureau