

# RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

---

---

HEARINGS  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE ELDERLY  
OF THE  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

Part 1.—Washington, D.C.

OCTOBER 22 AND 23, 1962

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1963

91888

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.—Price 35 cents

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

PAT McNAMARA, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
CLAIR ENGLE, California	BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey	FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
OREN E. LONG, Hawaii	WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah
MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Oregon	PRESCOTT BUSH, Connecticut
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada	WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania	
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho	
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	
BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, Massachusetts	

WILLIAM G. REIDY, *Staff Director*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE ELDERLY

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
OREN E. LONG, Hawaii	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania	WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	

FRANK C. FRANTZ, *Professional Staff Member*

NOTE.—Six hearings were held on relocation of the elderly and they are identified as follows:

- Part 1.—Washington, D.C.
- Part 2.—Newark, N.J.
- Part 3.—Camden, N.J.
- Part 4.—Portland, Oreg.
- Part 5.—Los Angeles, Calif.
- Part 6.—San Francisco, Calif.

# CONTENTS

## CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

OCTOBER 22, 1962

Spector, Sidney, Assistant Administrator, Office of Housing for Senior Citizens, Housing and Home Finance Agency-----	Page 2
Swick, Edgar H., Director, Office of Right-of-Way and Location, Bureau of Public Roads; accompanied by David R. Levin, Deputy Director, Office of Right-of-Way and Location, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce-----	13
Rafsky, William, development coordinator, city of Philadelphia, representing the American Municipal Association-----	22
Keith, Nathaniel S., president, National Housing Conference-----	32
Harmon, A. J., president, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials-----	35
Shishkin, Boris, secretary, Housing Committee, AFL-CIO-----	38
Jacobs, Mrs. Jane, author, formerly associate editor, Architectural Forum-----	47
Kaufman, Jerome L., principal planner, American Society of Planning Officials-----	59
Dutton, W. C., executive director, American Institute of Planners, accompanied by Robert Gladstone, chairman, National Housing Policy Committee-----	67
Johnson, Mrs. Cernoria D., director of the Washington Bureau of the National Urban League, representing Whitney R. Young, executive director of the National Urban League-----	73

OCTOBER 23, 1962

Clarke, Brig. Gen. F. J., Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia---	80
Volkman, Nathan, Urban Renewal Office, and Doris Wilkins, Landlord-Tenant Service, Department of Public Welfare-----	82
Washington, Walter E., Executive Director, National Capital Housing Authority, accompanied by Edward Aronov, Assistant Executive Director; Mrs. Olive Swinney, Chief of Social and Community Services; William Perry, housing manager, Arthur Capper Dwellings; and Mrs. Mary Bennett, public health nurse in Arthur Capper area-----	90
Stone, C. Sumner, Jr., editor, Washington Afro-American-----	97
Grier, George W., research associate, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies-----	100
Doyle, Phil A., Executive Director, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency-----	105

### STATEMENTS

Clarke, Brig. Gen. F. J., Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia---	80
Doyle, Phil A., executive director, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency-----	105
Summary of family counseling service to elderly persons, by Rebecca F. Griffin, family counselor, inserted by Mr. Doyle-----	106
Dutton, W. C., executive director, American Institute of Planners, accompanied by Robert Gladstone, chairman, National Housing Policy Committee-----	67
Grier, George W., research associate, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies-----	100
Harmon, A. J., president, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials-----	35

	Page
Jacobs, Mrs. Jane, author, formerly associate editor, Architectural Forum.	47
Johnson, Mrs. Cernoria D., director of the Washington Bureau of the National Urban League, representing Whitney R. Young, executive director of the National Urban League.	73
Kaufman, Jerome L., principal planner, American Society of Planning Officials.	59
Prepared statement.	64
Keith, Nathaniel S., president, National Housing Conference.	32
Rafsky, William, development coordinator, city of Philadelphia, representing the American Municipal Association.	22
Shishkin, Boris, secretary, Housing Committee, AFL-CIO.	38
Letter to Senator Williams, dated October 24, 1962, from John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO.	45
Spector, Sidney, Assistant Administrator, Office of Housing for Senior Citizens, Housing and Home Finance Agency.	2
Stone, C. Sumner, Jr., editor, Washington Afro-American.	97
Swick, Edgar H., Director, Office of Right-of-Way and Relocation, Bureau of Public Roads; accompanied by David R. Levin, Deputy Director, Office of Right-of-Way and Location, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce.	13
Tate, Mayor James H. J., Philadelphia, Pa., prepared statement.	22
Volkman, Nathan, Urban Renewal Office and Doris Wilkins, Landlord-Tenant Service, Department of Public Welfare.	82
Letter to Senator Williams, dated October 26, 1963, from Clifford C. Ham, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., containing comments.	111
Washington, Walter E., Executive Director, National Capital Housing Authority, accompanied by Edward Aronov, assistant executive director; Mrs. Olive Swinney, Director of Social and Community Services; William Perry, housing manager, Arthur Capper Dwellings; and Mrs. Mary Bennett, public health nurse in Arthur Capper area.	90



## RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1962

U.S. SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE  
ELDERLY OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senator Williams (presiding).

Committee staff members present: William G. Reidy, staff director; Frank C. Frantz, professional staff member; Jack Moskowitz, counsel; John Guy Miller, minority counsel.

Senator WILLIAMS. We bring our hearings to order.

Mr. SPECTOR, do you mind being an involuntary listener to a statement here?

Mr. SPECTOR. I would be delighted, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. The Special Committee on Aging, the Senate's newest committee, was created at the beginning of last year. During its first year of operation, the committee conducted a total of 34 public hearings in Washington and in cities in all parts of the country.

This comprehensive effort was designed to gather information on the problems that older people have and to lay the groundwork for more intensive studies of particular problem areas. Five of these hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly, of which I am a member. This subcommittee published a report on its findings in August of this year.

Among the problems that stood out in testimony the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly received last year was that of the displacement of older people because of changes in the land use in the neighborhoods in which they live. It became clear that we don't have the facts we should have about relocation. We do know that people have to move from crowded urban areas whenever we rebuild or put a new highway through a town. We know that other Government programs cause similar dislocation, but we don't know the full impact of existing programs, and we certainly haven't given enough thought about the future.

It is obvious, I think, that the future holds the prospect of even greater disruption and change. Urban renewal, for example, has only begun to change the face of our cities. Much of our future highway construction will be directly in urban centers. If we already have many unresolved relocation problems caused by existing programs, what will the future hold? I am convinced that relocation could become a roadblock to some of these programs unless all levels

of Government work together and arrive at effective policies that deal adequately with human problems caused when families and individuals must move from neighborhoods they have known all their lives.

The Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly was established by our chairman, Senator Pat McNamara, to delve more deeply into the special problems involved in relocation of elderly people, to see what we are doing to anticipate and plan for these problems and to gather a basis of fact for improving relocation policies and practices. The hearing this morning is the first in a series which we will have for these purposes.

Our elderly citizens, of course, are among those most hard hit by the change within the heart of metropolitan areas. Fifty-eight percent of those persons over 65 years old who live in urban regions live in the central city. In fact, 10.5 percent of the central city population is 65 years or over. They are in the central city, in most cases, because the expense of moving, and the prospect of higher rents elsewhere has made change unattractive. When it becomes necessary to uproot them for vital projects of all kinds, every possible step should be taken to cushion the shock of disruption. This hearing, and those to follow, will investigate the present situation. We will hear from those who are already doing much to help the elderly and other citizens who are affected by relocation. We will hear, too, I am sure, from those who believe that much more should be done.

One of the prime purposes of our studies, too, will be to determine whether we have any projections that will satisfactorily give us some idea of the dimensions of future relocation, our plans to satisfy the housing needs caused by relocation, and our resources to accomplish this. I have already made the statement that I suspect that these problems will be great, and that future programs could be endangered unless we solve them. We need more, of course, than suspicions. We need facts. If we are not yet accumulating this data, it is high time that we should.

I am sure that we are going to have a good beginning right now when we hear from Mr. Sidney Spector. He is no stranger to these parts, and is sorely missed here in the Senate. He was a staff man, but now is doing very important work in the executive branch. The forum is yours.

**STATEMENT OF SIDNEY SPECTOR, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR,  
OFFICE OF HOUSING FOR SENIOR CITIZENS, HOUSING AND HOME  
FINANCE AGENCY**

Mr. SPECTOR. Senator Williams, it is a pleasure to be here this morning. I want to just take a moment to congratulate the full committee, its staff and its subcommittees on some very important work in the last year and a half. I think the reports on health and housing for the elderly have been very notable contributions, and mark real milestones in the history of improving the conditions of our aged in this Nation.

I have with me, Mr. Chairman, Mr. James Banks, who is the Assistant Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration for Relocation and Community Organizations, and Mr. Arthur Gang, who is the

Deputy Chief Counsel of the Urban Renewal Administration, and who will provide the legal backing in discussion of urban renewal programs.

I have a relatively brief statement here which I would like to read, if that is the pleasure of the committee.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is fine.

Mr. SPECTOR. There are 21 million people 62 years of age and over, and by 1980 we expect at least 30 million in this age group. The over-65 population increases at a net rate of 400,000 each year. Thus while the general population increased 19 percent from 1950-60, the age group over 65 rose 35 percent. The fastest growing group in this Nation is not the younger elderly, but the older senior citizens—the age group 85 and over. In the 1950-60 decade, this group increased by more than 60 percent—three times as fast as the general population and approaching twice the rate of the 65-plus population.

It gives rise to what many of us call the provision of housing for not one, but two generations of senior citizens.

The aged of the Nation have peculiar problems which require special attention in the field of housing. These are problems which no other age group incurs to the same degree.

(1) *Retirement.*—Most are retired and out of the labor market. They spend a major portion of their time in home environments and seek and need meaningful activities in their retirement years.

(2) *Health.*—Most of the elderly are mobile but 8 out of 10 have 1 or more chronic illnesses; they spend twice as many days in hospitals as those under 65, and housing has to take account of this impact.

(3) *Incomes.*—Most of the aged fall into the low- or moderate-income categories. Half of the aged families have incomes above \$3,000 a year; half have less. About half of the single aged have incomes less than \$1,050 per year; half have more.

(4) *Widowhood.*—Almost half of America's senior citizens are in a single status—widowed, divorced, separated, or unmarried. There are almost 6 million widowed persons among the elderly, mostly women, with specially severe problems of isolation, income, and personal adjustment.

(5) *Loneliness.*—With retirement, lowered income, widowhood, and reduced physical capacity often come loneliness and the feeling of uselessness. Living arrangements can counter these tendencies through the development of a meaningful community of neighbors and friends.

The numbers of older persons and these special problems are of particular relevance to the subject of this hearing on involuntary relocation of senior citizens. Just as the younger population of the Nation have moved to metropolitan areas, so have the aged. Seventy percent of the people 65 and over now live in urban areas and 6 out of every 10 in this group live in the central city. Heavy concentrations of old persons live in the oldest portions of these cities. For example, the aged constitute 9.2 percent of the Nation's population, but in the South End of Boston, this committee was told the concentration was 16 percent.

This means that a substantial portion of older persons live just in those areas where urban renewal redevelopment and other public pro-

grams are most likely to stir. It means that the aged, to a disproportionate extent, will incur the emotional and economic difficulties of displacement and relocation.

Even under ideal circumstances relocation is a disrupting force creating an abiding sense of crisis over the loss of a home, a neighborhood, friends, and a community. For the aged the difficulties are compounded manyfold as the disruption affects life-preserving relationships to the past, the present, and the immediate future. It comes at a time when income is lowest, health problems greatest, and when emotional attachment to a home and a way of life is most intense and necessary.

In their present living quarters many aged have worked out arrangements with family, friends, and neighbors and church. They use a corner grocer who often gives credit and delivers groceries. They know a doctor or nearby clinic and receive treatment with understanding. Thus displacement and relocation of the aged as a result of public programs are a great responsibility and every effort should be made to alleviate the traumatic hardships which may accompany the process.

But with sensitive understanding of the problems involved and with trained counseling and assistance, relocation may turn out to be a blessing rather than a tragedy for thousands of older persons living in substandard housing. It can become an opportunity to identify degrading and unsafe living conditions among the aged, and through proper psychological and financial tools a means of obtaining housing for senior citizens which is suitable for dignified living.

When this Committee on Aging held hearings in various cities, it found through personal visits by its members that many aged persons, striving for dignity, security, and happiness, were living in small single rooms without day-to-day contact with friends and relatives; were eating in cheap, unsanitary restaurants or cooking unrefrigerated food with inadequate equipment, usually a hotplate. They were often imprisoned in their rooms by long flights of stairs. In one city the executive director of the Settlement Federation described environmental hazards, including assaults and bag snatching, and the reluctance of doctors to make home visits to older patients in the area.

Older persons, like people at any age, are individuals, with varying needs, desires, and cultural backgrounds. The process of relocation should also be individual with opportunities for the satisfaction of these multifaceted wants and needs. Research in this field is notable for its paucity and lack of scientific security, but the few basic gerontological studies of relocation indicate that housing for persons involuntarily displaced should meet the following objectives:

- (1) Enhance social relationships, and develop a sense of community.
- (2) Stimulate self-reliance, dignity, and meaningful living in the retirement years.
- (3) Be easily accessible to health facilities, good shopping, and public transportation.
- (4) Be near churches, schools, community centers, and social services.
- (5) Meet the income limits of older persons.
- (6) Be safe and efficient in relation to the physical and psychological changes which occur with age.

The available research reports indicate that most older persons desire and actually do relocate in the same area and neighborhood. The redevelopment plan should satisfy such desires to every extent possible. However, relocation to another neighborhood where community life and physical surroundings are responsive to senior citizens' needs may also be desirable. Every spatial wrench hurts, but the grievance for the lost home may be mitigated or completely overcome by trained understanding and assistance.

One dramatic example is a case of relocation resulting from the careful work by the Child and Family Service Agency in Portland, Maine. I should like to quote from the report of Louise Citrine and Catherine Moore:

An elderly lady with her eyes shining—and her difficulty with English requiring gestures—hurried the worker through her large apartment, exclaiming “sun, the sun, I have all day.” Thirty years in a tiny building crowded between two taller ones had allowed her a brief few minutes of pale sunshine each morning and that was all. There would be more windows to clean and she was 73 years old but for her it would be a pleasure.

#### MEETING THE RELOCATION PROBLEM

There are several programs in the Housing and Home Finance Agency which recognize the serious nature of the problems of relocating older persons and which attempt to meet these problems in an effective manner. Some measure of success has been achieved, and it provides the basis for taking advantage of current momentum to move ahead more rapidly.

#### THE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

The Urban Renewal Administration has adopted a basic policy that proper rehousing of displaced families is an essential responsibility of the urban renewal program. It will provide financial assistance for local urban renewal projects only after it has received and approved a feasible plan for relocating persons who are to be displaced.

The urban renewal law specifies that the Federal contracts for financial assistance in the execution of urban renewal projects must require a feasible method for relocation of displaced families, and that there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area, or in other areas not generally less desirable, in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

In addition, the law authorizes local public agencies to make relocation payments to families, individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations. These payments—made from Federal grants—are for reasonable and necessary moving expenses, as well as for actual direct losses of property resulting from the displacement from the urban renewal area.

In administering the relocation provisions of the law, the Urban Renewal Administration requires the local urban renewal agency to assume responsibility for:

- (1) Demonstrating that existing and anticipated local housing resources will meet relocation needs;
- (2) Formulating an acceptable program for orderly relocation; and
- (3) Providing competent "family relocation" staff services to assist families in obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

In addition to Federal payments for moving expenses and property loss, each locality can provide supplemental assistance to individuals and businesses in locating replacement housing or business quarters. Family relocation assistance, however—since it is required by Federal law—must be provided by every locality.

Although the relocation requirements of the urban renewal law are limited to families, URA encourages the local urban renewal agencies to increase their relocation services to include single persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations wherever possible.

#### RELOCATION PROGRAMING

In planning an urban renewal project, the local agency obtains information on the number, characteristics, and needs of families to be displaced. It also prepares estimates of the number of standard dwelling units to be available during the relocation period, from the existing supply of private rental and sales housing, public housing, and from new construction. These estimates are grouped to show size of unit, monthly rental or sales price, and availability to minority groups.

The relocation program of the local urban renewal agency includes:

- (1) Description of proposed administrative organization for carrying out the relocation program;
- (2) Delineation of local standards of "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing for relocation;
- (3) Determination of rent-income ratios to measure the ability of families to pay for relocation housing;
- (4) Identification and inspection of permanent relocation accommodations;
- (5) Notification and information programs to let families know about the relocation assistance to which they are entitled;
- (6) Provision for a family referral service;
- (7) Provision for solving special relocation problems, including those of minority group families, elderly persons, and welfare cases;
- (8) Relocation payments;
- (9) Determination of the proper time schedule for the relocation program; and
- (10) Submission of progress reports to URA on relocation accomplishments.

#### RELOCATION IN OPERATION

A family relocation service is established by each local urban renewal agency to assist all families residing in any structure in the project area at the time the property is acquired by the agency or other public body. The URA encourages the local urban renewal

agencies to enlist the cooperation of established commercial, real estate, welfare, religious, minority interest, and other civic agencies and organizations, to broaden community understanding of relocation problems and to enlist community assistance in solving them. Some agencies establish relocation advisory committees for this purpose.

Before relocation begins, a personal interview is held with each family to explain the relocation service and to evaluate family needs in terms of composition, income, place of employment, special problems, and preferences. These factors are considered by the local urban renewal agency in helping families, through referral service and other types of assistance, to obtain rehousing in accommodations meeting approved local standards for "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing.

In certain instances, the local agency may arrange for suitable temporary rehousing while permanent accommodations are being sought. For example, dwellings in the project area may be unsafe for continued use; or demolition schedules may require that structures be vacated before suitable rehousing is available. The local urban renewal agency continues to be responsible for assisting temporarily relocated families to be rehoused permanently in dwellings that meet local standards.

#### RECENT ACTIVITY

During 1961, the use of such Federal aids as public housing and special FHA mortgage insurance for relocation purposes was re-emphasized, and a training program for the local urban renewal agency family relocation staff was further developed. Increased cooperation between the local urban renewal agency and public and private social welfare agencies was also encouraged.

In early 1962, to assure a more adequate supply of standard housing for displaced site residents, the Urban Renewal Administration tightened relocation requirements. Special emphasis was placed on better local relocation planning, especially in relation to needed new housing construction. In addition, more timely and more concentrated attention to the relocation needs and problems of displaced site occupants was made mandatory.

We have an Assistant Commissioner for Relocation and the urban renewal staffs of the Housing Agency regional offices were given new responsibility for providing additional help and assistance to localities with relocation problems. Closer coordination of urban renewal and public housing projects, improved community information programs, and submission of more detailed and comprehensive relocation programs are now required before Federal approval is granted for local urban renewal projects. The new requirements should help make decent housing more readily available to many of the displaced families who have special difficulty in obtaining housing because of such factors as age, race, low income, or abnormal family composition.

#### SOME STATISTICAL RESULTS

During the past 13 years, more than 127,000 families of all ages have been displaced by urban renewal. Of this number, almost 80 percent moved to standard housing. The remaining 20 percent were almost evenly divided among those who either moved out of the city,

could not be located at their new addresses, or who moved to sub-standard housing and refused further offers of assistance from the local urban renewal agencies.

### HOUSING FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

The Congress now has authorized a series of programs to assist in financing the provision of housing specially designed to meet the needs of older persons. The expansion of this type of housing, now underway at an accelerated stage of gaining momentum, will provide dignified living arrangements for many displaced aged within their means and with an opportunity for social and community participation.

### LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

For the low-income elderly persons who require relocation, there is increasingly available low-rent public housing specially designed for them. Approximately half of all public housing placed under annual contributions contract in fiscal year 1962 was designated for low-income older persons, many of whom were displaced by urban renewal and other governmental programs.

Rentals in public housing are based on incomes of the residents and thus are within the means of the low-income elderly. The Housing Act of 1961 authorized additional annual Federal contributions of \$120 per elderly family to assist projects where their solvency is threatened by accepting large numbers of low-income senior citizens as occupants.

As of June 30, 1962, there were 841 projects with 61,170 units specially designed for senior citizens in various stages of processing from preconstruction to actual management. Over 100,000 units, or more than one-fifth of all public housing dwellings, are occupied by elderly families. The median gross rent (including all utilities) was \$32 per month and the median income for senior citizen families moving into public housing in 1961 was \$119 per month.

### DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM

The direct-loan program of which you know so much, Mr. Chairman, having been the financial father from its beginning.

Congress has authorized the Housing Administrator to make direct loans to nonprofit groups, consumer cooperatives, and certain public agencies for rental housing for the elderly. These loans may be made at a low rate of interest (currently 3½ percent) for terms as long as 50 years, and for 100 percent of the total development cost. This program assists in the provision of housing for those older persons whose incomes are just above the public housing limits, but not adequate for the regular market.

These units are specially designed for senior citizens and are located in regular neighborhoods, often right in the urban renewal area. With the substantially reduced interest rate, long-term loans, and the contributions of nonprofit sponsors, this program can provide suitable housing for many older persons in the renewal area at rentals they can afford.



The 1962 session of the Congress increased the authorization for this program by \$100 million, raising the total to \$225 million. As of June 30, 1962, there were approximately 140 active projects, representing over 14,000 units at an estimated cost of \$160 million. Of these, reservation of funds (either loaned or earmarked for loans) had been made for 68 projects, totaling 5,800 units and \$66.3 million. Approximately 70 projects were under active review amounting to 8,600 units for a dollar volume of \$97.1 million.

### FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE

A third major program is administered by the Federal Housing Administration. The FHA insures mortgages financing rental housing for older persons up to 100 percent of replacement cost for non-profit groups and up to 90 percent for profit-motivated groups. The maximum rate of interest is  $5\frac{1}{2}$  percent, a one-half of 1 percent mortgage insurance premium is charged and the loan terms may be as long as 40 years.

This program is available for rental housing for persons of all incomes, and may offer more extensive services and facilities. FHA housing may be located in urban renewal areas, in suburbs, and other suitable locations. All projects are built to at least minimum standards with particular thought for safety, fire protection, health care, recreation, and community facilities.

As of June 30, 1962, the FHA had 197 active projects, representing 30,733 units and mortgage insurance amounting to \$352.6 million.

### NURSING HOMES

Mortgage insurance for the construction or rehabilitation of nursing homes is available to proprietary groups through the FHA. This program serves other than older persons, but the older patients make up the greater proportion of the residents. The program is helpful to those persons who require relocation, but who have disabilities which require constant nursing care.

The Congress in 1961 increased the maximum amount of a nursing home loan from 75 percent to 90 percent of the value of the property when completed. As of June 30, 1962, there were 168 active projects representing 14,341 beds for total mortgage insurance of \$86.5 million.

Thus we are now providing housing for senior citizens of low and middle income levels. There is low-rent public housing for low-income senior citizens, there is a program of mortgage insurance for rental housing for middle income senior citizens, and a program of direct loans for the lower middle income aged. They all assist in relocation of the elderly. These programs all operate under a philosophy sensitized to the needs of the elderly and to the emotional blows older people incur in the relocation process. The housing is located in suitable communities, it promotes social relationships, stimulates participation in community life, and sustains independence. It is safe and efficient.

These programs constitute major steps in insuring suitable housing attuned to the needs of older persons subject to involuntary reloca-

tion. They do not, of course, meet the totality of the problem and we in the Housing Agency look forward with anticipation to the studies of this committee in this important field.

### THREE MAJOR POINTS MIGHT BE STRESSED

(1) The need for research in this area is urgent. The amount of reliable, scientific information on the magnitude of the problem, the depth of its social and psychological consequences, the need for trained personnel, the parameters of personnel adjustment after relocation, and the projections over time are sparse indeed. Social scientists in universities, institutes, and in Government agencies at all levels should be stimulated to make major contributions in this area. Basic research in problems of relocation may lead to important basic generalizations about human behavior.

(2) This is uniquely an area where increased State and municipal participation is essential and will pay off heavily in identifying pathology in living conditions, treating it sensitively, and in rehabilitating deprived senior citizens to productive, happier living. States and local governments have a great stake in this area and should increase their technical and financial participation.

(3) The number of trained personnel available to carry out the process of relocation of older persons is small and badly needs to be increased. Here again universities and training centers should be stimulated to undertake short- and long-term academic training programs. Public and private agencies can develop in service programs to train more personnel capable of understanding the process and able to meet its complexities and difficulties.

The special needs of the aging are now a recognized area of national concern and the social requirements of those elderly requiring relocation, because of public programs, are especially important and difficult. These needs and requirements can be met with continuing study and effort.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Spector. You have given a great deal of understanding of the problems before this committee and we continue to look forward to your observations on our work in this particular field and we look forward to some specific recommendations at a later time, no doubt.

Do your colleagues have anything to offer at this point before we get into a little discussion? If not, under the urban renewal program, it is mandatory that families who are displaced be relocated, but it is not where a single individual is concerned.

Mr. SPECTOR. That is true.

Senator WILLIAMS. Isn't this a shortcoming in the legislation or in the program?

Mr. SPECTOR. I myself think it is. I think we ought to do something about it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Particularly in view of your statistics on the number of elderly people who are single, widowed, et cetera.

Mr. BANKS. I might say that while the Federal law does not specifically require the relocation of single persons, there are few localities among the more than 500 undertaking urban renewal programs, which do not make plans for the relocation of single persons. This might be strengthened by additional legislation.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you seen examples of your various elderly housing programs included in plans for urban renewal areas?

Mr. SPECTOR. One of the things that I tried to emphasize in our Office of Housing for Senior Citizens with sponsors who are interested in any of our programs is the need for housing for the elderly in urban renewal areas or in any areas where relocation is taking place. In our direct loan program some of this already is occurring. I think, increasingly, sponsors are going to be involved in this process. For example, in Detroit, the Four Freedoms Group, which is made up of a number of unions who have formed together to undertake housing for the elderly, are planning to have housing under the direct loan program in the urban renewal area of Detroit.

I recall, in New Brunswick, N.J., that a public housing program for the elderly must be completed by now. It is an excellent building in the downtown urban renewal area. This will be an increasing phenomenon right along.

Senator WILLIAMS. I imagine the New Brunswick housing is occupied now. I was there last winter and the building was in the process of being completed. It is a magnificent scheme for easing the problems of older people in housing.

Mr. SPECTOR. Yes, it is an imaginative design. I think it will lead to the kind of community which older persons need so badly, which is often disrupted by relocation, but which can be restored by that kind of a building.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you familiar with the provisions of the housing bill that was introduced by Senator Clark as the primary sponsor, and others of us joined with him? It was introduced at the end of the session.

Mr. SPECTOR. Yes, I have seen the bill.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is your understanding of the bill in terms of its special attention to problems of the elderly, that is, housing problems?

Mr. SPECTOR. I think the bill is an important piece of legislation and one that we, in HHFA, are going to have to consider very seriously with regard to our position on it. I don't have a specific position on the bill itself, or its provisions at present.

Senator WILLIAMS. I wonder if my friends here on the staff, Frank Frantz or Jack Moskowitz, have any questions at this time? I think we ought to lean on you a bit this morning.

Mr. FRANTZ. I had one question that Mr. Banks could give us some information on. Just what data do you regularly require and receive from the local agencies on the characteristics and the numbers of people who are to be relocated which enable you to evaluate and approve their relocation programs?

Mr. BANKS. The basic information coming from the local urban renewal agencies includes the size and the incomes of the families to be displaced and the color, and the number of dwelling units available or to be made available in the community or to meet the needs of the families.

We ask also for specific information about families with whom they expect to have problems—elderly families, nonwhite families, or other groups which would seem to pose problems in relocation. In this we ask for specific data. We are now developing a requirement that

information on the ages of the family heads of families to be displaced by urban renewal be included so that we can get a more realistic measurement of the problem of the aged as it relates to urban renewal displacement. We expect that this will go into effect probably around the first of the year.

Mr. FRANTZ. Do you have any way of determining that the units which the local agency is counting on for relocation include units which will be suitable for elderly people who will be relocated?

Mr. BANKS. Yes. This is especially true with public housing. Our regulations, which were changed in June of this year, require that any public housing to be provided for families to be displaced by an urban renewal program be under what we call an annual contribution contract, when the urban renewal project is approved. This assures us that all steps necessary to assure sites and financing have been taken.

The Public Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration have been very busy trying to develop a workable coordinated program to assure that the housing which is proposed by localities to meet the needs of displaced families is available when it is needed.

One of the problems in the past has been that it comes a little too early or too late to meet the needs of the displacees. We are trying to eliminate those differences so that the housing comes at the time that it is needed. The procedure for accomplishing this has been improved.

Mr. FRANTZ. Just one more thing. Mr. Spector mentioned, in his statement, that 127,000 families have been displaced, I believe, in the past 13 years. Do you have any estimates of the numbers that will be displaced in the next 5 or 10 years?

Mr. SPECTOR. I believe we made an estimate that by 1970 approximately 1 million families will have been displaced or will have required relocation.

Mr. BANKS. That number will have been involved in the approved urban renewal plans through that date.

Mr. SPECTOR. I think we will need some technical wording on this. Approximately a million families would be involved.

Mr. BANKS. From the beginning of the program, in 1950 or 1951.

Mr. SPECTOR. These will not be all elderly. These will be families of all ages.

Mr. FRANTZ. Presumably 10 or 15 percent would be elderly.

Mr. SPECTOR. I think that would be a very good estimate.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Spector, if I may, in your statement, you clearly point out that there is more to the problem of relocating the elderly than just providing a facility that is economical or within the financial means for rent, is sanitary and safe. I would like to ask if, in the present regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in requiring the relocation plan from the local public agencies, there is any other requirement except the minimum requirements that are written in, must be within the financial means and must be a sanitary place.

Mr. SPECTOR. Such problems as the need for a community environment whenever people have to move? I will refer to Mr. Banks.

Mr. BANKS. We do not have specific requirements which cover that kind of need. I might say that we don't have the specific requirements because the needs have not been defined in a manner which could lead to workable requirements. What we are doing at the moment is cooperating in a program which has been undertaken recently by the University of Pennsylvania, with money made available by the Ford Foundation, to examine the problems of the aged displaced by urban renewal in six cities. As this demonstration is done, there will also be demonstrations done with funds from the 314 program of the Urban Renewal Administration. Out of this combination of studies we hope to come up with some more definite ideas as to the kinds of requirements which are needed to protect the interests of the aged. These demonstrations should begin in June 1963.

Mr. FRANTZ. Do you feel that the present legislation gives you sufficient authority, if you do recognize what these needs may be, to make regulations with respect to this in dealing with the local public agencies?

Mr. BANKS. This is hard to say at this point because the studies might turn up some problems which would require new legislation. But I am sure that within our present legislative commitments we can make some changes in regulations along these lines.

Mr. SPECTOR. That was a question of interpretation of the law and of policy that may or may not require new legislation. Perhaps Mr. Gang might comment on our legal authority.

Mr. GANG. The kind of relocation resource that must be provided is specified in the statute. It must be decent size and sanitary. It must be reasonably provided with public utility service. It must be reasonably related with regard to place of employment of the persons displaced. I agree that we can at least ascertain whether the local public agency is taking into account the specific needs of families that are being displaced in referring them to such resources as are available.

I suspect before we institute any mandatory requirements that specific types of resources be provided for elderly families we would need some additional legislation.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, gentlemen. I again express the thanks of our subcommittee.

Mr. SPECTOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been a pleasure to be here.

Senator WILLIAMS. Our next scheduled witness is Mr. Edgar H. Swick, representing the Bureau of Public Lands of the Department of Commerce.

**STATEMENT OF EDGAR H. SWICK, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RIGHT-OF-WAY AND LOCATION, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS; ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID R. LEVIN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RIGHT-OF-WAY AND LOCATION, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I have with me Mr. Levin, Deputy Director of Right-of-Way and Location, who is quite familiar with the economic and social studies that we undertake from time to time in connection with our program.

Senator WILLIAMS. Very well. We are glad to have you both here.

Mr. SWICK. I have here a statement that I will read, if that is agreeable to you.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is fine.

Mr. SWICK. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and to have some part in these important deliberations.

The displacement of people from their homes, and especially the displacement of elderly people from their homes, surely deserves the best attention and talent we are able to provide.

The Bureau of Public Roads has been interested for some time in the effects that highways have on residents nearby and in the path of the highway.

During the past 5 years, we have participated with the States in over 20 different research studies to determine the effects of highways on residential areas and to learn better how to mitigate those effects which are harmful. In some cases, these studies have directed attention to the experience of residents displaced from the highway.

In a few cases, particular attention has been given to the effect that displacement for highway right-of-way has on elderly residents. In a recent report to the Congress (Studies of the Economic and Social Effects of Highway Improvement, H. Doc. 72, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), the Bureau summarized the findings from a number of studies, analyzing economic and social effects, including studies of highway impacts on residential areas.

We are now completing a more comprehensive analysis of economic and social effects of highways which also gives some attention to experience with highways in residential areas.

Today, I would like to refer briefly to some of the study findings which seem pertinent to your committee's considerations and to certain relevant experience gained by Public Roads and other agencies.

I would then like to call your attention to our efforts to ameliorate the problems faced by people displaced for highway improvements.

Information about the experience of people displaced for highway rights-of-way—about 15,000 a year for the Interstate—is far from complete. However, as suggested above, some relocation experience has been analyzed which would indicate that in general, people displaced for highway rights-of-way have improved their living conditions, and often have ended up in a higher quality residence than that which they formerly occupied.

Analysis of the experience of relocated residents in California suggests that the motivations of people who are moved, because the site of their former residence was needed for a highway, are quite similar to those of all people who leave one residence for another; they seek better living conditions in their new location.

This "inclination to get something better" is actually made possible of achievement by cash payments and the assumption by the State highway department of the transfer costs normally borne by the property owners.

This payment from the State is characteristically greater than it would have been had the sale been a transaction between private parties and often enables the owners to assume a stronger bargaining position when entering the local real estate market than might otherwise be possible.

In the case of structures which are relocated on new sites, the settlement which the State makes also facilitates the rewiring, replumbing, redecorating, and general modernizing and upgrading which often takes place when these properties are relocated. This upgrading becomes obvious when assessed values of original and replacement housing are compared. In one instance where 86 residents were displaced, the 58 displaced persons who settled in the same community ended having property worth more than all 86 people had possessed before the highway relocation.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where is that?

Mr. SWICK. This is in California. I believe it is in Sacramento.

A study which the Texas Transportation Institute did for the Texas Highway Department and the Bureau of Public Roads found a similar upgrading in housing following relocation. One hundred displaced homeowners in Dallas ended up in replacement homes which were newer and more modern and had higher value than original homes.

As shown by physical traits, tax valuations, and market values, the replacement homes of very few relocated persons were inferior to their homes before the highway taking.

We, of course, recognize that there can be serious problems in relocating residents from highway sites even though experience in the studies we have examined shows that relocation is generally followed by an upgrading in living conditions.

Moving may be costly, inconvenient, and time consuming. It may disrupt important social and family ties. Relocation may involve higher costs for housing.

These relocation problems may be serious for anyone and can be especially vexing for elderly people. For example, the Texas study, which involved homeowners averaging 60 years of age, found that mortgage indebtedness increased following relocation.

Before the highway displacement 29 percent of the owners had mortgages on their homes, whereas 52 percent of the owners who purchased replacement homes incurred mortgages. Also, the average indebtedness per mortgage for original homes was about \$3,000 compared with \$7,200 for replacement homes. Thus, even though about 60 percent of the relocated owners stated that they had upgraded their housing, 62 of 97 owners who had opinions stated that displacement had adversely affected their financial positions.

While some relocated owners were dissatisfied, the Texas A. & M. researchers concluded that the group as a whole fared very well in adjusting to resettlement problems and that "There were very few hardship cases from the standpoint of economic loss."

The problem which displacement for public projects may pose for the elderly was also emphasized by a recent study in Providence, R.I. This study analyzes the experience of elderly people dislocated from an older, blighted area near the downtown business district. Areas of this type are, of course, often selected as locations for urban highways since, if suitable from an engineering and economic standpoint, the dislocation problems are ordinarily easier of resolution than those involved in locating a highway through a more stable area.

People dislocated in downtown Providence were mainly tenants; only about 10 percent owning their homes. For residents over age 55, only 7 percent owned their own homes.

In several ways, the relocation appeared to be more difficult for the elderly residents than for those who were younger. For example, over half of those over age 65 reported trouble in finding similar accommodations compared with about a third of those under age 65.

Elderly people also reported more trouble in finding economical movers and help in moving. Perhaps because of these problems, and no doubt for other reasons such as social and psychological ties to an area from long residence there, older residents were more opposed to moving than younger people; 86 percent over age 65 opposed the move compared with about 60 percent for the younger residents who had to relocate.

The analysis of relocation experience in Rhode Island also revealed some tangible benefits to those directly involved. For example, elderly people generally upgraded their standard of living in the new locations, as shown by the easier access to kitchen and bathroom facilities and to television and radio entertainment in the new locations.

Yet, rents paid by elderly people were generally lower in their relocated homes. In the original area of residence, only 15 percent of those over age 55 paid rents of less than \$45 per month, while in the new location this proportion increased to 63 percent.

Experience in Rhode Island also revealed an adjustment to the posthighway situation that we believe may be fairly typical. Whereas about 90 percent of the elderly people objected to the move before it took place, only slightly over half of those affected remained opposed after the move was accomplished.

Our experience in other studies suggests strongly that the relocation problems resulting from a highway or from having a highway nearby are in fact less serious than affected people fear they will be.

While we clearly need to learn more about the effects that highway displacement has on people, especially elderly people, we have felt for sometime that enough is known at this time to justify Federal participation in relocation assistance and in certain moving expenses. That is why we have supported legislation to accomplish this.

As the President has stated:

To move toward equity among the various federally assisted program causing displacement, I recommend that assistance and requirements similar to those now applicable to the urban renewal program be authorized for the Federal-aid highway program. \* \* \*

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, just enacted by the Congress and approved by the President materially implements this recommendation.

The Secretary of Commerce will require satisfactory assurances by the State highway departments that relocation advisory assistance shall be provided for the relocation of families displaced by acquisition or clearance of rights-of-way for any Federal highway project.

The new law also provides for Federal-aid participation in State relocation payments, with specified limitations, for reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by displacement from real property acquired for any such project to the extent permissible under State law.

The limitations on relocation payments would be (1) \$200 in the case of an individual or family and (2) \$3,000 in the case of a business concern (including the operation of a farm) or nonprofit organization.



Senator WILLIAMS. This is permissive, not mandatory?

Mr. SWICK. These are permissive—if the State law will permit such payments. These provisions are designed to alleviate hardships to families and businesses displaced as a result of Federal-aid highway construction.

On the relocation of families, we estimate that about 15,000 families will be displaced each year in the next 6 to 8 years by the completion of the Interstate System.

Enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 points up the increasing attention being given to the problems of those displaced from their homes by Federal or federally aided construction programs.

In fact, in recent years, the trend has been toward special consideration of those displaced, both on the Federal level and on the State level as well. Seven States have enacted legislation requiring some form of relocation assistance in connection with highway construction, and in all but one of those the assistance applies to businesses as well as to residences.

For example, in California the general policy since 1945 has been that—

no tenant in a residential building will be evicted unless it is established that he has a reasonably comparable place to move, even if it is necessary to delay the freeway construction project.

In accomplishing this, California adhered to the following relocation procedures:

(1) The aid of local municipal authorities, real estate boards, and apartment associations is solicited in screening available housing and making recommendations to tenants when housing is needed.

(2) Various charity organizations are solicited to assist in finding alternate housing for those on public relief.

(3) Cooperation is established between the Division of Highways and the Federal Public Housing Authority, and tenants are nominated to fill vacancies in the public housing projects as they became available.

(4) As necessary, right-of-way agents are assigned to canvass tenants and personally assist in the location of alternate housing.

(5) If no other accommodations are available, tenants in the path of imminent construction are temporarily relocated to vacancies in other State-owned homes on freeway projects which are to be constructed at a later date.

Senator WILLIAMS. Will you give us the States?

Mr. SWICK. I don't have it in front of me. We can give it to you. (The information requested follows:)

The following States have statutory authority for payment of relocation costs:

Connecticut	Nebraska	Tennessee
Maryland	New York	Wisconsin
Minnesota	Rhode Island	

The following States (without actual statutory authority) have made payments for costs of moving or incidental to the moving of personal property from highway right-of-way as result of constitutional interpretation, condemnation, or other legal order or proceeding:

Colorado	Michigan	Virginia
Georgia	New Mexico	District of Columbia
Iowa	Oklahoma	Puerto Rico
Kansas	Utah	Wyoming

Mr. SWICK. In Maryland, the maximum assistance payments in most categories are higher than those provided under the newly enacted Federal-aid highway legislation. Maryland pays the actual costs of moving personal property of either residences or business establishments.

Payment to a business must not exceed \$5,000 in general, and must not exceed \$2,500 in the case of a business tenant whose unexpired lease does not exceed 3 years. The moving costs must, in general, be reasonable and necessary, and the distance moved must be reasonable. The State and its representatives must receive notice 10 days in advance of the move to allow adequate opportunity to inspect the property involved.

About a dozen other States which have no specific statutes on the subject make payments for moving or related costs under varying conditions as a result of jury awards, constitutional interpretation, or administrative action of the State highway department.

We believe that the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act probably will encourage desirable legislation and practice in all States, thus affording equitable treatment to our citizens most directly and immediately affected, from a personal standpoint, by highway construction.

I might add here that we found when we started to pay for utility relocations, the States tended to come into line as soon as Federal legislation was enacted.

A program of relocation assistance and payments is a logical extension of the right-of-way program. Property owners in the past have been compensated for property actually taken for highway right-of-way purposes, but they have been obliged to vacate their property and move at their own expense.

Some of the land needed for rights-of-way is occupied by families who rent or lease. They also have had to bear the expense involved in moving to accommodate a public improvement. This often represented a serious financial burden to the people involved.

For example, in Providence, moving costs were about \$28 for an elderly person, a cost which cannot be borne easily by individuals whose total monthly income was typically between \$75 and \$100.

It is not difficult to visualize the far-reaching results of removals of urban families from their accustomed places, without the tempering effect of the newly enacted orderly, statutory program of relocation assistance and payments. The families involved often have undergone not relocation, but dislocation.

It is hard to calculate the dollar amounts that have been lost by unassisted wage earners during the time required to search for a new location, not to mention the continuing losses suffered when in order to avoid further immediate monetary loss, the first available location was accepted whether suitable or not.

As suggested earlier, the relocation needs of elderly people are in some ways different and more urgent. Their relatively low and fixed incomes, social ties to the community where they live, desire and need to be accessible to services and friends, their reluctance to seek certain types of public relocation assistance, and their need for special types of housing make their relocation especially difficult.

Furthermore, elderly people may be more likely than others to be relocated from highway sites. This seems to follow from the fact that elderly people often are concentrated in the older parts of urban areas where many highway improvements are located.

In central cities, for example, about 10 percent of the people are over age 65 compared with less than 8.5 percent in rural areas and only about 7 percent over age 65 in suburban areas.

While special attention to the relocation needs of the elderly may be warranted, we believe the potential losses from highway displacement, including displacement of the elderly can be minimized or eliminated by a workable program of relocation assistance recommended by the President.

It may be that because of the apparent reluctance of some elderly people to seek relocation assistance, special efforts will have to be made to give them special assistance.

I have already referred to Federal legislation that now requires satisfactory relocation advisory assistance for families who are to be dislocated by Federal-aid highway projects.

In anticipation of this, we have prepared and are issuing guides for use by our division offices in working with State highway departments to assure that such relocation assistance is immediately available. The machinery now is ready to go into operation.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is "family" the description in the legislation?

Mr. SWICK. The description in the legislation is "family." As of this time we are going to interpret family to mean individual or family to the extent that we can on the assistance. We have no immediate plan to include businesses since it is definitely not provided by the act.

Senator WILLIAMS. You propose what urban renewal is doing even though the description for mandatory assistance is family. They are extending it to single individuals?

Mr. SWICK. We intend to do that; yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you estimate 15,000 families or individuals that are to be displaced?

Mr. SWICK. That is the family figure.

Senator WILLIAMS. So there are a lot more individuals than that?

Mr. SWICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is the annual rate presently; is that right?

Mr. SWICK. That is the annual rate anticipated for the remainder of the interstate program.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is the annual rate at present?

Mr. SWICK. That is what it is at this time and it will continue for 6 to 8 years.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would think that construction in built-up urban areas would accelerate because of the greater difficulty of getting agreement on alinement. Much of this has been the last to be built on the system, hasn't it?

Mr. SWICK. This is true at a number of places. California is an example where right-of-way acquisition has gotten ahead of the program. I believe this would probably about balance out.

Senator WILLIAMS. I know in the section of New Jersey where I live most of the major urban area development is yet to come.

Mr. SWICK. That is true in a number of cities.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. As I understand this assistance program, Mr. Swick, it provides assistance at the State's option for tenants also for moving, is that not correct?

Mr. SWICK. There are two parts of the assistance. One is that there has to be advice available. This is required whether or not a State can make relocation payments. As soon as the act goes into effect every State will have to provide assistance.

The second part of the act involves payments. At this time we don't know just how many States will find it legal to make these payments. We know that seven will. We suspect that probably a dozen more will. The others will require legislation.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. The tenant does not receive, as I understand, any compensation for property loss as the homeowner would. As I also understand there is no provision, or the provision of the current legislation does not provide for any requirement that there must be adequate housing or sufficient housing within the economic means of those people displaced. It just provides assistance.

Mr. SWICK. That is correct. I believe the bill originally introduced did provide that there had to be decent, safe, and sanitary housing available. But this was changed, I believe, in the House. As it is now enacted, assistance only has to be provided.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Do you have any feeling about providing that there should be adequate housing available above just providing the money?

Mr. SWICK. I think our position at the time the act was first considered was that there should be some positive way of assuring that this housing was available. Mr. Whitten's testimony was to that effect. I believe what has been enacted will go a long way in most areas to assisting in this problem.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I don't know if you heard Mr. Spector's statement, but the urban renewal program requires the filing of a relocation plan that meets certain requirements.

Do you feel that in highway programs some such requirement should be made either to be enforced by your agency or by some other agency, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, HEW, and so on?

Mr. SWICK. We feel that such a provision would be highly desirable. It is not provided by law now. We are hoping that the States will enter into the spirit of this thing and in effect provide something very similar in their assistance programs. We don't know, though. This is an unknown at this time.

Mr. FRANTZ. Mr. Swick, is the development of the regulations far enough along that you could tell us what the Bureau's criteria would be for satisfactory relocation advisory assistance under the new section?

Mr. SWICK. In connection with any project that involves as many as 25 relocations, there will have to be a separate office established in the area. This office may well be the office of an urban renewal agency. We will permit the States or we will encourage the States to use the facilities that urban renewal has required in an area rather than establish their own offices.

If there is not an available office of this kind then it will be necessary for the highway department to provide one. Where there are less than 25 relocations, this assistance will be provided by those people that are negotiating and working at the acquisition of the right-of-way.

The States will be required as a minimum to provide a list of available housing and keep it current, give the relocatee a fact sheet about his rights in the area and what he can expect to find. Some States have given us copies of the forms they propose to use for this purpose. They will be asked to supply the price range they are interested in, either rental or purchase, and this type of thing. These are the general provisions for the assistance part.

Mr. FRANTZ. Under this new section 133 the Department will have to find a program providing all of these services in existence?

Mr. SWICK. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have any machinery by which you communicate future highway plans to the housing agency?

Mr. SWICK. Yes, sir; we do. We have rather close liaison with the housing people, between our division engineers in the States and the local offices or the regional offices of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Senator WILLIAMS. This is a matter of regular communication?

Mr. SWICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that requirement in any legislation or any program?

Mr. SWICK. No, it is not a requirement of legislation. It has been given a considerable emphasis throughout the last 2 years. I think it is now working as well as it can be expected to work.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Levin, do you have anything to add?

Mr. LEVIN. I don't, Mr. Chairman, except as Mr. Swick has indicated, we have 19 or 20 States which now have in their own States mandatory requirements. Wisconsin and Maryland both require payments in excess of the Federal payments under their own acts.

While all of these various provisions have been discussed in connection with the 1962 act we have already noted a discussion and other actions in the States which do not now require payments which lead us to believe that there will be considerable activity in the remaining States which do not require this at the present time.

Senator WILLIAMS. What fund pays these payments?

Mr. LEVIN. The relocation payments?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. That would come out of the trust funds as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. SWICK. These would be the highway funds in the States from the same sources, generally speaking, from which the highway construction is paid.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is it totally paid out of the Federal share?

Mr. SWICK. I didn't understand.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is it paid in toto from the Federal share?

Mr. SWICK. No. The provision is just the same as for the other Federal operations. Interstate 90-10, primary, secondary, 50-50. The sources are the same as for the other highway activity.

Senator WILLIAMS. If that is all, we are grateful for your help. We promised Mr. Rafsky that we will permit him to take his plane back to the center of controversy.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM RAFSKY, DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR,  
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN MU-  
NICIPAL ASSOCIATION**

Mr. RAFSKY. I certainly appreciate this opportunity to be heard at the beginning of the hearing because of my commitments back home.

I first want to extend the regrets of Mayor Tate who had hoped to be here this morning, himself, but found pressing business back home prevented him from coming and he personally asked me to express his appreciation for this opportunity.

Rather than read the statement prepared by the mayor on behalf of the American Municipal Association, with your permission, I would like to touch on the highlights rather than reading the entire text.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will put the entire text in the record, if that is what you wish.

Mr. RAFSKY. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mayor James H. J. Tate follows:)

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES H. J. TATE, MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA**

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am James H. J. Tate, mayor of the city of Philadelphia and a member of the executive committee of the American Municipal Association. I appear before you today on behalf of the American Municipal Association, an organization representing some 13,500 municipal governments across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we representatives of local government are gratified to note the interest of the committee in this significant field, involuntary relocation of people—particularly elderly people—because of governmental actions. For many years, Mr. Chairman, local governments have borne the brunt of this problem in the face of what often seemed the determined efforts of other levels of government to aggravate rather than help the situation. We are impressed with the past work of the Committee on Aging and we are hopeful that the studies of this subcommittee will be equally worth while.

I am not completely convinced, Mr. Chairman, that this problem of involuntary relocation can be separated cleanly into its impact on the elderly and its impact on others. It certainly would be our experience that the elderly tend to occupy dwellings in the core cities of our Nation's metropolitan areas. And, further, many elderly people of limited means tend to occupy dwellings in blighted areas of these cities. Since this is true, the elderly do suffer disproportionately in the taking of these areas for urban renewal projects, highway projects, and other Federal, State, and local projects.

But it is also my belief that in order to improve the lot of the elderly in involuntary relocation, it is necessary to improve the lot of all people who must be relocated because of governmental action. Once basic reforms have been made, the special attention can be directed at the special problems of the aging.

Earlier I mentioned that the local governments have borne the brunt of this problem of involuntary relocation. I should like to amplify that statement. Through our local redevelopment agencies, local governments have been doing the job of relocating people displaced by redevelopment activities. And these agencies have also often fallen heir to relocation problems created by other governments. If the State or Federal Government condemn land, for whatever purpose, the redevelopment agency relocates those who are uprooted. Of course this works a double hardship on the redevelopment agency. As you know, the Housing Act requires that persons displaced by redevelopment action be offered safe, decent, and sanitary housing. It is quite difficult to plan redevelopment actions without knowing the dimension of the relocation load. Will it be increased through a sudden decision to locate a State office building? Will a new highway route add to the problem? These are but a few of the problems which can occur to seriously impair the best thought-out redevelopment program.

We certainly feel that relocation is most important. But we also feel that there is a joint responsibility. If the State or Federal Government is responsible for the relocation problem through one of its programs, then the State or Federal Government should share in the cost. The 1962 Highway Act did take

some steps in this direction—but it did not go the whole distance by any means. Previously, no Federal funds could be committed to relocation payments for the highway program. Situations have developed in which adjoining highway and renewal projects would see one neighbor receiving relocation payments while the other would not. And, I might add, that while you and I knew it was the Federal Government who did not make the assistance available, the citizens assumed that city hall was the culprit. The 1962 act did allow Federal relocation payments, if such payments are authorized first by the States. Naturally, our association vigorously supported this provision although we would have preferred that such assistance not depend upon State authorization.

We have also suggested that the same kind of Federal participation be extended to the public housing program which, like the pre-1962 highway program, authorizes no Federal funds for relocation payments.

Here then, Mr. Chairman, is the first step we suggest in the relocation field: adequate financial assistance to those displaced by governmental action, and we stress that the Federal and State Governments should pay their share of the costs.

A second suggestion is: all governments creating relocation problems should coordinate their actions and inform local governments as far in advance as possible of their intentions. This should be a routine first step of any government when it seeks to acquire land in one of our cities. Unfortunately, it is not. Perhaps we need a joint organization which could at least share information and planning data on acquisition of city land.

Let me point to another area for your consideration. We already have redevelopment agencies established in all of our major population centers. These agencies have the experience and tools to deal with the relocation problem. They do lack, however, the overall responsibility and the planning data. Perhaps these agencies should be designed to deal with this problem. The redevelopment agencies certainly should be fully consulted by all governments in their prospective actions. These agencies could very well be the coordinating agents in this area. This does, however, raise a problem. If the redevelopment agencies are the logical leaders in the redevelopment field, some additional form of financial support should be found. It would seem that additional support should be forthcoming from State and Federal Governments.

If we can achieve centralized responsibility locally for relocation problems with adequate finance of the agency performing the work as well as adequate financing for the relocation itself, then we will have taken a long step in meeting this problem.

Philadelphia and its redevelopment authority have had some success in relocating elderly families and single persons. With experience we are becoming increasingly capable of recognizing the problem areas and working effectively with senior citizens we must relocate as a result of public improvement programs.

To get some idea of the overall problem in Philadelphia you should know that two-thirds of the aged who head households own their own homes; the other third rent. The percentage who live in substandard housing is 1.2 percent, a tenth of that for renters, 12.8 percent. But the combined percentages represent more than 5,000 aged Philadelphians in substandard housing.

In the past 10 years, we have learned that a good renewal program depends largely on an effective relocation program. Therefore we have tried to maintain a diversity of housing types and costs in the housing inventory, to develop in the centralized relocation bureau a professional staff trained to deal with the social aspects of relocation, to work closely with private groups and the Philadelphia Housing Authority to provide the specialized housing needs of the elderly. We maintain close liaison and a professional working relationship with private and public welfare agencies and the real estate and banking fraternities.

During the past year, there were 391 elderly families relocated as a result of title I activities and an additional 30 asked to move as a result of city housing code enforcement. While these families represented only 20 percent of the total workload of our centralized relocation bureau, it is estimated that more than 30 percent of professional staff time was required to resolve special problems of the elderly before relocation. Almost all of these families moved from seriously substandard housing or depressingly poor environmental conditions into good, stable neighborhoods characterized by sound housing, good public transportation and adequate community facilities including shopping and city services. In all cases elderly families were rehoused in homes or apartments meeting the city housing code standards and the somewhat higher standards established for suitable relocation.

Of the total, 196 families owned their homes prior to moving, and 109 of these bought other homes. The others did not purchase for a variety of reasons, mainly because they preferred rental housing with less maintenance.

Nearly all the elderly families relocated were receiving some help from social security, welfare assistance, or private pension funds. Records show that 149 had a total monthly income of less than \$100; 243 had income of \$101 to \$200; 21 from \$201 to \$300; and 8 had incomes of more than \$300 per month.

In 32 cases they paid from \$500 to \$1,000 more for their new homes than they received from the authority as compensation for their old homes, while 28 families paid \$500 to \$1,000 less. The remaining 49 paid approximately the same. With the help of the centralized relocation bureau and local lending institutions, 45 elderly families were able to create new mortgages of sufficiently long terms to carry on their fixed incomes. Three families, former tenants, purchased homes with FHA 221 insured mortgages.

Elderly families who lived in rented homes prior to relocation generally were moved to better housing and environmental situations at an average increase of approximately 11 percent for shelter. This statistic was largely due to the fact that (34) families had been paying less than \$30 per month. In practically every case where satisfactory relocation resulted in an increase in monthly housing costs, it was found that the family could afford the added cost or could pay it through an increase in welfare assistance.

One of the keys to the continued effectiveness of the centralized relocation bureau in working with these elderly families is the close cooperation of the public welfare agencies in helping to obtain necessary welfare assistance increases for housing.

I would like to offer a few representative case histories as example of the kind of work we are doing in Philadelphia to rehouse elderly families.

Mr. and Mrs. A. are 72 and 68 respectively. They had owned their own home for 12 years and live on a monthly pension of \$92. Living a spartan existence and relying in part on relatives for clothing, medical care, and small luxuries at holidays, they were barely able to get by. They took pride in home ownership, considering it a mark of respectability, and wished to remain homeowners. After we worked with the family for over 8 months, they were prepared to meet the problem of moving. With the help of private realtors, they were shown numerous homes. One, in which they were particularly interested, was in sound, modern condition, in an excellent location, but would cost \$400 more than the \$6,800 the family would receive from the redevelopment authority. A firm offer of \$6,800 was made and accepted. The title company used by both the authority and the private realtor donated its services in the transaction. A neighborhood lawyer donated his services to the family at settlement. Even with this help, closing costs amounted to \$76. The family was advised to accept \$84 as a fixed relocated payment. This money was used to meet the closing costs. The relocation worker arranged with a local church group to move the family without charge. In the process both members of the family were referred to Philadelphia General Hospital to have their eyes examined and a full explanation of the situation to the social worker at the hospital resulted in the family receiving badly needed free glasses. In addition, two nieces were visited by the relocation specialist and the elderly couple's situation impressed upon them. The nieces promised to visit the older couple regularly and help whenever they could. The minister at the church in the neighborhood to which they moved was asked to welcome the family, as were also many neighbors and the chairman of the local neighborhood association. Two months after moving the couple seemed to have made a good transition and appeared to be enjoying their new friends and neighborhood.

Mr. B., age 75, is the son of Mrs. B., age 97. Total income is \$161.40 from county board of assistance and social security. No serious health problems existed, although Mrs. B. reportedly suffered from neuritis and was obviously in the advanced stages of senility. They had always lived together—in the same rented apartment for 44 years. Over a period of months the relocation worker tried to alleviate their anxieties and the situation was discussed realistically, resolving into two main alternatives: They could move into a Philadelphia Housing Authority apartment, or to Riverview, the city's home for the aged and infirm. Both of these plans were discussed with a responsible younger daughter (aged 47) who later accompanied her mother and brother to Riverview and to public housing facilities. They decided that because of their advanced ages Riv-



erview offered the greater number of facilities. After discussion with the caseworker at the county board of assistance, and approved by them, applications for admission were prepared and the family was accepted at Riverview. Followup telephone calls 3 and 4 months later indicated that the family had made a successful transition.

Mr. C. is a 72 year old ex-seaman, living alone. Before relocation he lived in the same rental unit for 17 years, paying \$11 a month. He has no relatives, his mind is not clear, and he is prone to outbursts of laughter without apparent cause. Months of the most skillful work produced little in the way of results. Finally, his case was discussed with the caseworker at the county board of assistance and their records were made available to our relocation worker. Information contained in these records made it possible for the worker to understand his problem and thus gained the confidence of Mr. C. in frequent visits over a 4-month span. He was receiving \$73.80 per month assistance. A decent dwelling unit was found for him in the area of his preference for \$35 a month. This was accepted by Mr. C. As a result of the relocation worker's conference with the county board of assistance, their financial help was raised to \$102.80 per month (the maximum) based on Mr. C.'s increased cost for housing.

Mr. and Mrs. D. have a total income of \$171 from a Pennsylvania Railroad pension and social security. Their ages are 81 and 65. They own their own home, valued at \$4,800. As a result of a prolonged illness over 20 years ago which required financial aid from the county board of assistance there were liens on the property totaling \$3,100. A small modest home in excellent condition was found for the family at a cost of \$6,300. The county board of assistance agreed to transfer its liens to the new property. (Payment of these liens is only demanded upon the death of both parties.) A local lending institution granted the family a 12-year, \$2,000 mortgage, making it possible for them to purchase the new property with monthly carrying charges of \$32, including taxes. It was estimated that the family would pay less than \$50. per month for all housing expenses, including heat and utilities. Followup visits revealed that this family was delighted with their new home.

Obviously, working with elderly families to bring about successful relocation is not an easy task. Neither Philadelphia nor any other city has the required tools to do the job in a completely effective manner. The factor of fixed, limited income is often accompanied by physical and emotional problems which demand special care and professional sensitivity. It also demands a long lead time in working with these families. Under present Housing and Home Finance Agency administrative regulations the Centralized Relocation Bureau is unable to supply professional services to these families prior to approval of part I of the loan and grant contract. It is the hope of the city and the redevelopment authority that this ruling be changed as requested to allow the Centralized Relocation Bureau to supply services and prereslocation advice, counsel, and assistance during the approximately 18 months' survey and planning period, when it is publicly known that a project plan is being developed. We feel that it is only through this kind of intensive work that the trauma caused by forced relocation can be minimized and the time during this planning period be used productively to prepare the elderly families for relocation with the help of every available private and public professional skill in the community.

A major factor in rehousing the elderly is the number of housing units especially designed and provided for senior citizen occupancy. In Philadelphia, we are taking advantage of all of the Federal aids, including public housing and the special FHA and CFA programs. The Philadelphia Housing Authority is now housing over 1,600 elderly families or single persons. The authority has 321 units especially designed for elderly occupancy under construction, 151 such units out for bid at this time, and 148 approved and in planning.

Private church groups have also been encouraged to sponsor projects for the elderly. The redevelopment authority has made land available to Bright Hope Baptist Church in the Southwest Temple Renewal Area for the building of 26 units for the elderly. Mount Olivet Church will be building 140 units on land to be provided by the redevelopment authority; a Friends project for the elderly, now out for bid, will contain 62 units on land made available as a result of redevelopment. The redevelopment authority received just last Friday a proposal from the Allen AME Church in University City to build 150 units of housing for the elderly, if the redevelopment authority provides the land. Certainly these are not enough units to meet the ever-increasing need. We feel that

the initial, difficult steps have been made and that we are now moving in the right direction—to provide the kind of housing which our elder citizens require.

It is essential, therefore, that Congress continue all of the current programs designed to help the elderly and to provide sufficient appropriations to carry out the authorized programs. Although at present, new housing developments for the elderly in a city like Philadelphia are not many, there is a tremendous momentum which I am confident will produce many more demands for the various Federal programs.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that we commend this committee for its actions and we look forward to the results of the committee's efforts so that further light may be shed on a complex issue. Our cities are dealing with relocation every day. We look forward to more knowledge from your work and effective guidelines for sound legislation in this area.

**Mr. RAFSKY.** As you know, the American Municipal Association is an organization that represents some 13,500 municipal governments across the Nation, and the association representing these local governments is gratified to note the interest of this committee in this significant field, namely, the involuntary relocation of people, particularly elderly people, because of governmental actions.

As you know, the burden of relocating these people has been borne by local governments which have had to carry out this particular function without any help except under the title I program of the Urban Renewal Administration. Some of our local governments have carried out with their own financing some of these responsibilities, while others have been unable to do so.

It is important, therefore, to begin facing up—as has this committee—to the responsibilities of Federal agencies in all of their programs as they tend to displace individuals and families.

As you have already pointed out in your opening statement, the elderly are a particular problem because they had to occupy substandard dwellings in poorer areas of the Nation's cities.

In talking about relocating the elderly we cannot divorce it from the problem of relocating all of the people and families who are dislocated. We think this problem that you are facing up to has to be thought of in the broader context as well. In fact in terms of a city like Philadelphia, which has taken responsibility for all the governmental displacement, it is almost impossible to plan adequate relocation plans and other public improvements without measuring the total relocation load.

As you may know, the Housing and Home Finance Agency now requires of any city through its workable program that it demonstrate how it would handle all dislocatees regardless of the source if it is to qualify for title I urban renewal aid, public housing, and the other programs it administers.

So we think that you have to look at the problem from a complete point of view in any community. The State and Federal Government is responsible for its share of the relocation problems.

In this sense we welcome the fact that the 1962 Highway Act has already taken a step in this regard. However, we feel that that Highway Act has not gone far enough because it limits those payments to areas or States which have authorized this particular type of payment for dislocation.

Our association vigorously supported this provision although we would have preferred that such assistance not depend upon State authorization.

We also suggested that the same kind of Federal participation be extended to the public housing program and we believe that it could go across the board as far as Federal agencies are concerned.

Therefore, in terms of a first step and a first recommendation in the relocation field the American Municipal Association believes that there must be adequate financial assistance to all who are displaced by government activity.

Secondly, we suggest that all governments creating relocation problems should work very closely with the local governments. We would like to see the Federal agencies inform every local area as to the extent of dislocation expected. In Philadelphia, for example, we developed a form which we circulate annually not only to our city departments but also to the State and Federal Governments.

Replies from the Federal agencies are not forthcoming. We do not know and we have not been able to include that adequately in our own programing for dislocation. We believe; therefore, that the Federal agencies should cooperate with the local governments in first providing the information, and where they are unable themselves to handle the relocation program on a local basis, to contract with existing agencies within the local community to carry out their relocation function for them. In doing so we would recommend that the standards used in such relocation services be those now developed by the Urban Renewal Administration which require the filing of a relocation plan, which make payments 100 percent to dislocatees and which also insure certain standards in terms of service and the amount of moving costs.

I think I can illustrate our desires by pointing to the experience we have had in Philadelphia where because of our intense activity in this field we have had some success. Philadelphia has approximately 5,000 aged Philadelphians in substandard housing that can be affected by our various housing and urban renewal programs.

In order to meet this need we have tried to maintain a diversity of housing types and costs in the housing inventory. We recognize that relocation is more than the physical job of finding decent shelter of minimum safety and sanitation and so we work very intensely on the social, health, and welfare problems both by having trained staff to the extent that we are permitted, as well as working closely with private and public welfare agencies.

During the past year we have relocated 421 elderly families, primarily as a result of our urban renewal program and to a lesser extent because of our housing code enforcement program. This represented 20 percent of the total workload of our centralized relocation bureau, but the time of our staff was at least 30 percent in terms of working on the elderly.

Almost all of the families that were moved from seriously substandard housing or depressingly poor environmental conditions were moved into good, stable neighborhoods characterized by sound housing, good public transportation and adequate community facilities including shopping and city services. In all cases elderly families were rehoused in homes and apartments meeting the city housing code standards and the somewhat higher standards established for suitable relocation.

We were able to do this primarily because of the urban renewal program and because our city council makes available a special fund for dislocation created by city agencies.

Our experience last year did not involve any Federal dislocation but in previous years primarily because of highway dislocation we could not provide the same kind of service. So we frequently find that families in the same general geographical area get treated differently when they are displaced, some getting the kind of treatment and special attention that we can provide through the urban renewal for the city program, and others get no attention at all and are left on their own.

Of the total families that we service in the elderly last year, 196 families owned their own homes prior to moving and 109 of these bought other homes. Those who did not purchase did so for a variety of reasons, mainly because they preferred rental housing which requires less maintenance. Nearly all of the elderly families relocated were receiving some help from social security, welfare assistance, or private pension funds.

Records show 149 had a total monthly income of less than \$100; 243 had income of \$101 to \$200; 21 from \$201 to \$300; and 8 had incomes of more than \$300. In 32 cases they paid \$500 to \$1,000 more for their new homes than they received from the city service on compensation for their old homes. Twenty-eight families paid \$500 to \$1,000 less. With the help of the centralized relocation bureau and local lending institutions 45 elderly families were able to create new mortgages of sufficiently long terms with the limited income.

Our lending agencies have fully accepted the Federal aid that Congress has adopted and is providing mortgages beyond the normal life expectancy of the elderly and base their values on the quality of the house itself. In the rental field elderly families were moved to better housing environmental situations at an average increase of approximately 11 percent for shelter.

This statistic was largely due to the fact that 34 families had been paying less than \$30 a month. In practically every case where satisfactory relocation resulted in an increase in monthly housing costs it was found that the family could afford the added cost or could pay it through an increase in welfare assistance.

In this regard, as I have pointed out before, we worked very closely with the welfare agencies both public and private and particularly in the assistance field to obtain additional allowances for housing. We have established the kind of cooperation with our private agencies where we set up for the first time in one of our major urban renewal areas a self-help center in which families and individuals about to be relocated in a building and with a staff serviced by the Government agency but in addition through voluntary contributions by such welfare agencies as the Y and settlement houses are given assistance before they move as to the adjustment problems they will have to make in a new neighborhood.

These include maintenance of the home, repair of furniture, budget problems and getting acclimated to a new neighborhood. This is done without any Government funds as far as the private welfare agencies are concerned, and this is a field in which we feel there has to be some assistance, otherwise we don't think it is feasible for the private agencies to be able to carry on this kind of program.

Mr. Chairman, in the written testimony that has been prepared we have cited four or five specific case illustrations of how in Philadelphia we have helped elderly families relocate. I hope that the committee and the staff take a look at these because I suspect that other witnesses before your committee will be making statements based primarily on generalizations that the elderly have been ignored and hardships have been created without concern on the part of local government.

In Philadelphia where there are tools we can demonstrate that we have taken the necessary concern in the adequate relocation of the elderly. Obviously, working with elderly families to bring about successful relocation is not an easy task. Neither Philadelphia nor any other city has the required tools to do the job in a completely effective manner.

The factor of fixed, limited income is often accompanied by physical and emotional problems which demand special care and professional sensitivity. It also demands a long leadtime. Here we would like to mention a specific request that we think is necessary even in the urban renewal program.

At the present time, except for the survey type of work during the survey and planning period, we are not permitted to expand relocation funds to supply services and prelocation advice, counsel, and assistance during the approximately 18 months it takes to do survey and planning.

We believe if we were authorized to do this that we would do a much better job in handling the relocation, particularly of the elderly who need a good deal of attention during the preliminary period.

A major factor in rehousing the elderly is the number of housing units especially designed for senior citizen occupancy. We try to take advantage in our city of all of the Federal aid from public housing through FHA mortgage insurance and the community facility administration direct loan programs. Through our housing authority in Philadelphia we provided over 1,600 elderly families or single persons with decent housing. In urban renewal alone, four nonprofit agencies are taking advantage of the CFA program to put up housing for the elderly. There are a half dozen others who are working to get up plans outside of urban renewal.

We believe, therefore, it is essential for Congress to continue all of the current programs designed to help the elderly and to provide sufficient appropriation to carry out the authorized program.

In concluding, therefore, I would like to summarize the recommendations that I have presented this morning.

No. 1, we believe that every Federal agency displacing families and individuals take full responsibility for seeing that they are adequately rehoused. This means, in our opinion, that their budget has an item for relocation just as it may have for engineering and planning and the other normal activities.

This means, for example, that when the General Services Administration carries on a building program in a local community through the lease-back device in which it is dealing with a private business, that budget, too, provide for relocation.

Secondly, that where the Federal agency does not have a local agency carrying out the program, such as a State highway depart-

ment or a local redevelopment agency, that they contract with an appropriate local government agency to carry out the relocation function. We believe that this should be done at the very high standards which the Urban Renewal Administration has adopted but which I think can be improved, and it be done without any State legislative support if this is not available.

Thirdly, we believe that in all of these programs the relocation funds should include more than the moving expenses and the survey funds. It should provide (1) for special staff who can cope with the problems of the elderly, such as social workers and related professionals.

(2) That they have staff who will work to see to it that private builders and developers take advantage of the many Federal aids to set up housing for the elderly if the community itself does not have enough units for that purpose.

(3) That money should also be made available on a contract basis to private welfare agencies now in the field who are in a good position to help provide the special services the elderly need.

(4) We believe that the Urban Renewal Administration and any other agency where this applies should permit the use of relocation funds even during the survey and planning period. We recognize that this may entail a slight risk if the plans are changed and some families are advised who later do not have to be relocated. This is a very modest risk in view of the problem involved.

(5) We suggest and recommend that Congress continue all of the Federal aid programs for housing for the elderly, including public housing, FHA mortgage insurance, and CFA direct loan program.

(6) We recommend that every Federal program which can create a relocation problem be checked with the local government and particularly the planning agency to see how the impact of that displacement can be minimized.

This goes for highways as well as the building programs that are the responsibility of the General Services Administration.

(7) We support funds for research to get in greater detail at the problems of the elderly, particularly those in the difficult problem of being dislocated.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that we commend this committee for its actions and we look forward to the results of the committee's efforts so that further light may be shed on a complex issue. Our cities are dealing with relocation every day. We look to more knowledge from your work and effective guidelines for sound legislation in this area. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is a magnificent statement. You have answered in that many of my questions. I just wonder about this impediment of granting services during the periods of planning. What is the impediment? Is it money or is there a restriction in your operating program?

Mr. RAFSKY. It is a restriction in the legal interpretation of the operating program in that the Urban Renewal Administration says that until there is an approved urban renewal plan which is the product of survey and planning, they will not permit us to spend money on the special relocation services we would like to apply during that period.

Senator WILLIAMS. There are a lot of people that do desire to relocate very early in an urban renewal program even as soon as an area is described as blighted.

Mr. RAFSKY. That is correct.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is true that after an area is defined as an area of blight there is an impediment there on individual homeowners that prevents them from improving their own properties. They just can't get the money.

Mr. RAFSKY. The same thing is true of a rented property. The landlord finds he has vacancies and will not service the remaining tenants. We believe there ought to be an orderly relocation process in this period. In fairness to the Urban Renewal Administration, they do permit this under certain limited circumstances.

If the local community puts up its own funds they are willing after certain safeguards to permit payment for relocation. But this is a small part of the total.

Senator WILLIAMS. How many units of housing for the elderly do you feel are now in the planning process under the three programs in the city of Philadelphia?

Mr. RAFSKY. Roughly speaking, we think there are 1,500 units that are more than just an idea. Namely, that there is land and the sponsoring organizations or the Public Housing Administration are actually getting ready to break ground.

Senator WILLIAMS. And you anticipate 5,000 elderly will have to be relocated if your present program goes through?

Mr. RAFSKY. That is correct. Bear in mind these are 5,000 whom we identify in the worst areas in the city. There may be others who have more comfortable means who may also be affected.

Senator WILLIAMS. Was that figure of 5,000 derived from the total planned program, highway, urban renewal, GSA?

Mr. RAFSKY. No, it is only derived from the program as we identify areas that are potential urban renewal areas and where we know the highways are going.

We have a number of proposed highways where the routes have not been pinned down.

Mr. FRANTZ. On page 3 of your prepared statement, Mr. Rafsky, you make two suggestions that look as though they would involve the same administrative machinery.

Am I correct that the American Municipal Association would support legislative amendments which would call for uniform relocation standards and practices, with a single local agency responsible for all public displacements?

Mr. RAFSKY. It would support the first part of your statement. The second would have to be qualified if you came to a community which had no other program except highways. They might not have available an agency to handle it.

The concept as you describe it is correct, they would prefer to have one local agency handle all of the dislocation problems.

Mr. FRANTZ. These two suggestions which you made here, the financial assistance and the planning would be worked into that?

Mr. RAFSKY. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. As usual, the American Municipal Association has been most helpful and you individually have been, too.

Mr. RAFSKY. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Nathaniel S. Keith, who is president of the National Housing Conference.

**STATEMENT OF NATHANIEL S. KEITH, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE**

Mr. KEITH. Thank you, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. You may proceed in any manner you wish.

Mr. KEITH. Thank you. I have a brief prepared statement, Mr. Chairman; perhaps I might read it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Very well, you may proceed.

Mr. KEITH. I appreciate the opportunity to present to this subcommittee the views of the National Housing Conference on the problems involved in the increasing dislocation of elderly families and individuals by urban renewal, urban highways, and other redevelopment of built-up areas.

The National Housing Conference is an organization of public spirited citizens and community and professional leaders from all sections of the country. While traditionally our focus has been on housing programs, our range of interests covers the entire complex of community development problems, accentuated as they are by the Nation's unprecedented population growth. These problems include the provision for adequate community facilities—schools, parks, and playgrounds—of adequate public utilities and facilities, and of adequate transportation. They include the renewal of deteriorated areas and the promotion of sound, well-planned suburban development rather than sprawl. These are over and above the massive and still unmet challenge of providing satisfactory housing for all families and individuals—in all income ranges and in all age groups.

Against this background, the National Housing Conference has long recognized the growing and specialized problem of housing for elderly families and individuals. We took leadership in advocating and supporting the legislation which resulted in the various Federal programs now in operation.

We have studied the excellent first report of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly which was issued on August 31, 1962. In our opinion, the members and staff of the subcommittee are to be congratulated for this searching and comprehensive analysis of the problem. We are also generally in accord with the recommendations contained in the report, although we have some further recommendations which I would like to present for your consideration in this statement.

As I understand it, the primary focus of your hearings today is the additional impact on elderly families and individuals resulting from physical dislocation caused by public or private action. Your report presented the significant statistics showing that a higher percentage of elderly households are in substandard dwellings than is the case with nonelderly families. This in part reflects the fact that, in many older deteriorated neighborhoods, elderly couples and individuals represent to a large degree the residual population after the younger generations have graduated to better neighborhoods.



As a result, the elderly segment of our urban population is particularly vulnerable to the impact of urban renewal and other measures of city rebuilding.

What are the best approaches and solutions to this problem? Certainly it would not be in the public interest to defer the essential renewal and expansion of the physical structure of our communities because the displacement of elderly families and other families is involved. The constructive approach and constructive solution is to strengthen and improve our relocation techniques and, more basically, to expand the housing supply available for the specialized needs of all age groups and income levels.

With regard to relocation techniques, 12 years of experience under the urban renewal program have developed on the whole a successful approach to the complex problem of rehousing displaced families. Fortunately, the amendment to the Federal Highway Act enacted by the past session of Congress has now closed the glaring loophole in Federal relocation requirements which has existed throughout the massive urban highway program initiated 6 years ago.

Actually the displacement of families and individuals by urban highways has substantially exceeded the comparable impact from urban renewal as such but until now there has been no Federal requirement or financing procedure for meeting this major segment of the relocation load.

The relocation of elderly families and individuals involves special problems which reflect the particular housing requirements of the aging and which are compounded both by the acute shortage of shelter meeting those requirements and by the meager financial resources of most persons in the age brackets above 65 years. From our knowledge of local relocation programs, we are confident that these special problems are fully recognized by the personnel of the community agencies charged with the relocation responsibility.

However, the basic solution to the problem of successful relocation of elderly families and individuals lies with the development and expansion of the supply of shelter fitted to their needs and financial resources.

Under the existing Federal programs for assistance to housing for the elderly, we have the potential means of developing an increased housing supply for elderly persons of low income and for those in the middle income brackets and higher. We support the recommendations in your subcommittee's report as to the improvement and expansion of these existing programs.

Nevertheless, there still remains the problem of the families and individuals in the gap—those with incomes above the public housing level but below the level which can be accommodated by the direct loan program or by FHA insured financing. It is the position of the National Housing Conference that this residual problem can be resolved only by a flexible financing program that will gear interest charges to the incomes of the families or individuals to be housed. This cannot be accomplished under the statutory provisions of the existing programs and we therefore recommend that legislation be enacted to this end at the next session of Congress. That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Keith. I wonder if you are familiar with the experience generally under the rehabilitation program in last year's housing legislation?

Mr. KEITH. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the experience to date under that special rehabilitation provision has been extremely limited. There has been only a very meager utilization of that program by communities which is reflected, as I understand, in the extreme reluctance so far by private lending institutions to make this kind of loan even with FHA insurance.

Senator WILLIAMS. Does your organization support that?

Mr. KEITH. We supported it in the hope that it would become effective. Certainly the results to date have been extremely disappointing.

Senator WILLIAMS. The problem lies more with the lending institutions than with the property owners.

Mr. KEITH. That is my understanding.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would think if that program did catch on, it would be helpful particularly for older people who would prefer to stay close to their city or urban environment.

Mr. KEITH. I would certainly agree. It is my personal opinion that some stronger financing device is going to be necessary in order to make any volume of those loans feasible of achievement.

Senator WILLIAMS. Does your organization address itself to the particular problems of housing of elderly people?

Mr. KEITH. Our interest is across the board, Senator, and certainly includes very definitely the special needs of the elderly.

Senator WILLIAMS. When you gather you discuss design, materials and the business of building, don't you?

Mr. KEITH. That is true, and the problems of financing, and so on.

Senator WILLIAMS. There have been some significant advances in building in meeting special needs of elderly people, as I understand it.

Mr. KEITH. That is true. There have been some very fine developments that have occurred, and it is encouraging to see the increasing interest in communities throughout the country in developing housing for the elderly and in utilizing the existing programs.

Mr. FRANTZ. Mr. Keith, you spoke of this economic gap between those with incomes above the public housing program and below the level reached by the other programs.

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Mr. FRANTZ. Do you think the direct loan program has any potential for reaching farther down into that gap than it has done so far?

Mr. KEITH. I think the limiting factor is that there is nothing in the direct loan program as such that is going to reduce the capital cost and the cost of constructing adequate housing. The financing terms that are available under that program are about a third or permanent rents about a third less than what is required under the FHA section 31 program. In other words, the difference between a 3½ percent interest rate and a 50-year term and the FHA terms of 5¼ percent plus a half percent insurance premium plus amortization over only a 40-year term. To get below that level for families and individuals who are just above the public housing level, in our opinion further financial assistance would be required.

MR. FRANTZ. If you took an average rent of \$50 per unit, capitalized it and designed to that figure, you would probably not get an adequate facility, would you?

MR. KEITH. I would doubt that you could get a \$50 rent under the direct loan program. I think the figures bear out that on the average the rents are higher than that and necessarily so, because of the cost.

SENATOR WILLIAMS. Thank you again, Mr. Keith.

MR. KEITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR WILLIAMS. Mr. A. J. Harmon, president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

#### STATEMENT OF A. J. HARMON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS

MR. HARMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN, my name is A. J. Harmon. I am privileged to appear before your committee as president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. With me is Mr. John Lang, executive director of the association.

I am also the executive director and counsel for the Land Clearance for Redevelopment and Housing Authorities of Kansas City, Mo. In appearing here on behalf of NAHRO (which is the short version of the association's name), I speak for a private, nonprofit, professional association founded in 1933 and composed of about 5,700 agency and individual members actively engaged in housing, renewal, code enforcement, and community development activities throughout the United States.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to present our views on the subject of relocation of the elderly. The members of our association are deeply involved in matters concerning the provision of adequate shelter for our older citizens. We are keenly aware of what is happening in many communities throughout the country as urban renewal and other public programs displace thousands of persons and families. Experience shows that those hardest hit by these programs are families of limited financial means as well as families with serious health and other personal problems; furthermore, a very large proportion of these are elderly persons and families.

This is because the elderly are heavily concentrated in areas where housing, renewal, and other programs which cause displacement are underway and where future programs are being planned. For example, in Providence, R.I., in an area being cleared for a highway around the downtown business district, a 1960 report of the Rhode Island Division on Aging found that—

areas located in close proximity to the central business district \* \* \* typically contain a disproportionately large number of older, unattached persons than are found in most other parts of the city. According to the 1960 census, this part of Providence contained one of the highest proportions of population over 65 years of age of any area in the city \* \* \*. Of a total 481 residents of the area who were surveyed for the study, 209 were 50 years of age and over. Of this group, 138 were interviewed and 42 percent of them were in the 65 and over group.

In Sacramento, Calif., a section 314 demonstration grant study in 1959 showed that in a "slum labor market area" (a skid row type area) where population fluctuates between 4,800 and 6,000—

a striking characteristic \* \* \* is the comparatively advanced age of its members. More than a fourth of the 1957 sample survey were past 65, and almost another fourth were 55 to 64 years old.

NAHRO, of course, recognizes the need for renewal and other public programs to renew, upgrade, and conserve our communities; and, we accept the fact that along with progress in these programs there will necessarily be displacement. However, the association equally recognizes the need to provide for adequate relocation of the families and individuals displaced by these programs. For the sake of the welfare of the family and the community, all of us must accept our responsibility to these people.

This responsibility will become increasingly serious as the renewal program expands and, although there are no precise estimates available, we all know that the size of the elderly relocation problem is formidable and is growing each year. A recent report of this committee gave a good indication of the entire elderly housing problem. It also emphasized the unique financial and emotional nature of the problems that the elderly persons face when displaced from their homes. The implications for local agencies and programs, which must deal with these problems, are severe, and it is necessary to provide these agencies with adequate tools and programs to realistically deal with and ultimately solve these problems.

In formulating goals for relocation, NAHRO advocates and supports a uniform national policy on relocation of persons and businesses displaced by all governmental action, irrespective of the type of program causing the displacement or of the level of Government involved. We urge that immediate action be taken to establish and implement such a policy and we have recommended that legislation for Federal, State, and local programs of all types causing displacement be amended to provide uniform authorization for the displacing agency to undertake, and include as a legitimate cost:

(1) Administrative overhead for carrying out the responsibility of assuring that displaced persons have access to decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings at rents or prices within their means.

(2) Administrative overhead for carrying out the responsibility of assisting displaced businesses in finding suitable new locations.

(3) Payment to displaced persons and families of reasonable and necessary moving expenses and reimbursement for direct property losses and other incidental expenses related to their move, such as utility deposits and advance payment of rent, up to a specified maximum amount; alternatively, a fixed payment to cover these costs should be permitted.

(4) Payment to displaced businesses and organizations for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and direct property losses, up to a specified maximum amount (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses required to move within a geographical limit so set as to avoid interarea migrations) alternatively, a fixed payment shall be permitted businesses whose moving expenses are, in any case, small and who would prefer to waive submitting documentation of detailed actual costs and losses.

The Urban Renewal Administration now has statutory authorization to make relocation payments available to families and businesses displaced by renewal projects. Under this provision, financial as-

sistance to families is limited to specific amounts. Assistance to displaced businesses has been limited by administrative ruling to \$25,000—formerly \$3,000 by statutory limitation. This includes reimbursement for both actual moving costs and direct loss of property. In addition URA is now authorized to allow local public agencies to include as eligible costs the cost of administrative overhead involved in carrying out relocation activities. These are steps in the right direction and the association welcomes them. However, our goal is to see these measures applied uniformly in all public programs which dislocate persons, families, and businesses.

The association has recently undertaken a study in collaboration with the University of Pennsylvania and under the auspices of the Ford Foundation to test and explore methods of assisting those displaced by urban renewal and other public programs. Through our vast experience in renewal, we realize that the relocation of elderly persons and families involves dealing with unique problems and situations.

Incomes of the elderly are low, and their earning potential is limited; in fact, it declines as age advances. Our senior citizens are less able to absorb the shock of being displaced from their homes and their accustomed surroundings than are other age groups. It is very difficult for older persons to adapt to a new environment. They desire and need to be located in areas that are familiar to them, near friends and relatives, and services. These are special needs, characteristic of the aged, and must be met with methods and programs which will give full consideration to these needs and which will assist in adequately solving problems generated by these needs. Our elderly have pride and dignity which must be respected when programs are designed for them. For these and other reasons the association has chosen to undertake this study.

Out of this study, we hope to be able to recommend to local agencies guidelines as to the type of resources and staff required to provide for the special needs of the elderly. In addition, we hope that the study will provide guidelines for Federal legislation dealing with elderly displacement. I should like to request the privilege of filing, at a later date, an outline of the study.

The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials congratulates this committee for initiating these hearings and for its sincere efforts to provide a comprehensive solution to the problem of relocating elderly persons and families displaced through public programs. We hope that these hearings will result in legislative recommendations which will satisfactorily assist local public agencies in their efforts to relocate the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee on this important matter.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Harmon, we are grateful to you, and we are grateful to have NAHRO help on studies of this committee.

Mr. HARMON. Thank you.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I have just one question, if I may, Mr. Harmon. You not only hold a position with NAHRO, but you are also a local public official.

Mr. HARMON. That is right.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. We heard from several witnesses today who expressed a concern that the public programs create quite a problem in lifting the elderly citizen from his environment. There is some shock and some suffering, both financial, physical, and mental suffering. We would like to know, and I think the committee would like to hear from you as a public official, if you in Kansas City have faced this problem? To take a person out of the environmental situation he is used to and to make him face the fact he has to live in a totally new environment.

Mr. HARMON. It seems to me there is very little question that this is a more difficult area of relocation, that is rehousing the elderly person or family. It is a question not only of finances or the limitation of finances, but a question of infirmity or illnesses, handicaps of various kinds, their familiarity with their surroundings. I think one of the answers is that they have to be handled with much more care and much more time and effort in seeing that their problems are taken care of. This involves considerably more staff time than in the ordinary case of relocating a family that has ample means and is more mobile, so to speak.

Mr. FRANTZ. Mr. Harmon, you gave us some suggestions for legislation. I am wondering if you would favor building into such legislation a requirement that the special needs of older people be considered in their relocation. To give you an example of what I mean, the present law requires that you consider that the relocation housing be near places of employment. This is irrelevant to a retired person. But it is important for him to be near churches and stores and community facilities. Would a requirement that a total acceptable neighborhood environment for a retired person be found for his relocation be a workable kind of requirement?

Mr. HARMON. I think this might be desirable insofar as carrying out the relocation is concerned. I would have some question as to how this could be incorporated in legislation to be effective. A proper environment or residential environment clearly is a matter of construction. I would think it would be difficult to properly define it in a legislative sense. Perhaps as a goal or desirable result it could be incorporated in legislation.

Senator WILLIAMS. I guess that is all for now. Thank you very much.

Mr. HARMON. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Finally this morning, Mr. Boris Shishkin is with us from the housing committee of the AFL-CIO. We welcome you again before our committee, sir.

#### STATEMENT OF BORIS SHISHKIN, SECRETARY, HOUSING COMMITTEE, AFL-CIO

Mr. SHISHKIN. Thank you, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. I see you are well prepared.

Mr. SHISHKIN. I brought a little ammunition here to help the committee.

Senator WILLIAMS. The AFL-CIO statements are all very much respected and very helpful.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very glad to have this opportunity to be here and to present our views that we hope will be helpful to the committee.

Let me, first of all, commend your committee for undertaking this vital and timely study of the effects on elderly city residents of displacement from their homes and neighborhoods, as the result of public programs involving condemnation and clearance of urban land.

This is a very important study, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it will receive the kind of consideration and attention from the Senate and the Congress that it deserves, because it is not only extremely timely, but also very vital to a very large proportion of our citizens and to the cities in which they live.

We are glad to have the opportunity to present our views regarding this problem, to submit information regarding it, and to recommend legislative approaches that labor believes would be helpful in its solution.

American cities and metropolitan areas around them are facing the challenge of the bulldozer revolution. The price of progress is the inevitable dislocation of people whose lives are rooted in homes and neighborhoods that happen to be in the path of progress.

The brunt of the impact of this social dislocation falls upon those who are least able to meet and cope with it: our senior citizens.

We are dealing here with the nationwide problem of families and individuals who must be displaced by the positive desirable and necessary programs of public improvements.

These may be programs of highway construction, of construction of cloverleaves, ramps and approaches to throughways, freeways, and speedways needed to ease the choking traffic in and out of our cities.

Or, they may be programs of slum clearance and urban redevelopment, needed to clean out urban blight and to modernize, improve, and beautify cities in which we live. Or they may be programs of other needed public improvements.

Whatever these programs, their necessary and inevitable effect is to displace people. In their wake, we find Americans whose lives are disrupted, because they are compelled to move.

We must look upon these people as American displaced persons, the American DP's.

Since the source of these people's dislocation and stress is in the publicly initiated programs, we must develop public initiative and public programs to carry out two public purposes:

First, to help those who can to help themselves in their predicament.

Second, for those who find themselves helpless in their plight, to provide at least a measure of help they need to sustain their well-being, dignity, and self-respect.

The total problem of residential displacement resulting from public programs in our cities is one of staggering proportions.

In the city of Chicago alone, to take but one example, in the 11 years from 1948 through 1958, the clearance of land for all redevelopment purposes displaced residents at an average annual rate of 3,660 households, comprising 2,800 families and 860 other individual occupants. ("Rehousing Residents Displaced From Public Housing Clearance Sites in Chicago, 1957-58" special report to the Chicago Housing

Authority from the Department of City Planning, Chicago, October 1960, p. 7.)

Consider the impact of this displacement on residents over the entire 11-year period:

As indicated in the annual report for 1958 by the Tenants Relocation Bureau of the city of Chicago, a total of nearly 31,000 families and more than 9,400 other individual residents have been relocated to permit construction of new housing and other facilities. Three major programs have accounted for more than 80 percent of the total residential displacement during the 11-year period from 1948 to 1958.

Of the three, demolition for expressway routes represented 31 percent of the total. Low rent public housing sites accounted for a similar percentage, and clearance of blighted areas for private redevelopment by the Chicago Land Clearance Commission followed with 20 percent.

The remaining 18 percent resulted from a wide variety of public programs, including about 12 percent for all types of institutional expansion such as the West Side Medical Center development, together with sites needed for public school construction, parks and other municipal facilities, plus housing code enforcement and the removal of dangerous structures.

In the last 2 years the annual displacement increased substantially, with a total for 1958 of more than 4,400 families and 1,550 other individuals, largely reflecting an increase in displacement from expressway clearance which in 1958 represented 46 percent of the total displacement.

The foregoing pinpoints this experience in just one city—Chicago. It is, of course, a part of a much larger picture, the experience of American displaced persons all the way across the Nation. Let us take a quick look at it.

The census, in its National Housing Inventory, covering the period extending from 1950 through 1956, defines a "unit lost through demolition" as a dwelling unit which existed in April 1950 and which was demolished or razed on the initiative of a public agency or as a result of action on the part of the owner by December 31, 1956.

During this period, according to the census, approximately 1,131,000 units, or 2.5 percent of the Nation's 1950 housing inventory were lost through demolition. This figure does not include units lost through disaster or through other means, such as changing dwelling units into nonresidential space, rooming houses, or transit accommodations, where, of course, displacement of permanent residents was also the result.

Census figures indicate also that losses through demolition were proportionately higher in the South and West than in the Northeast and North Central regions.

In order to bring out the significant details, let me now change the focus again and take another close look at the experience in Chicago, as shown by the study I have already cited.

This study shows that most of the relocated households were long-time residents of the city. In fact, 87 percent of the household heads had resided in the city of Chicago for 10 years or more, and about 14 percent had lived in the city for several generations:

As to length of residence at the clearance site addresses—the Chicago study shows that—

the median period was also fairly long—8 years. Only 13 of the 190 household heads, or about 7 percent, had lived in the site locations for less than 1 year. Almost a third had lived there for 1 to 4 years. The largest proportion—46



percent—had lived there for 10 years or more. This indicates the strong neighborhood attachment which existed for many residents despite the generally poor level of housing.

A close look at the record of displacement in Chicago also reveals special problems that call for special consideration. In analyzing the magnitude of total residential displacement we have under consideration, we find that its impact on nonwhite residents was substantially higher than on white residents.

The National Housing Inventory of 1957 by the U.S. Census Bureau (Chicago supp., Bull. No. 7, table I, 1958) shows that, in Chicago, approximately 8,000 households were displaced by all public clearance activities during 1955 and 1956. This represented an average of less than 3 percent of the total residential movement for the city in those 2 years.

However, for the total nonwhite residential movement in the city, it represented about 7 percent, as contrasted with less than 2 percent for the total nonwhite movement.

This shows the impact on the nonwhite residents was almost three times as great as the whites.

This brings into focus what the Chicago study calls—

the most difficult aspect of residential relocation—the rehousing of nonwhite families and also residents with low incomes.

In this overview of the general problem of displacement of people brought about by public projects, let us now pinpoint and consider the special problem of displacement and resettlement of our senior citizens, for whom such dislocation constituted a vastly greater hardship.

An outstanding contribution to the study of this aspect of forced resettlement of our people is one by Sidney Goldstein and Basil G. Zimmer of Brown University, sponsored by Rhode Island Division on Aging, and published in 1960 under the title, "Residential Displacement and Resettlement of the Aged, a Study of Problems of Rehousing Aged Residents Displaced by Freeway Construction in Downtown Providence."

Among the significant findings of this study is the following:

As anticipated before moving, the greatest difficulty encountered by the aged was that of finding suitable accommodations and ones which were within the rent range which they could pay. A little over half of the aged cited these factors before moving. Half of the respondents also pointed to them following the move. Of lesser importance, but cited by over one quarter of the aged, were difficulties associated with the move itself; namely, the problems of packing and unpacking and the cost of moving. Among the groups under 65, these same problems were cited as frequently as that of finding suitable accommodations at low rent.

That the foremost difficulty experienced by the older folks in connection with displacement is economic, is emphasized by the following conclusion of the Rhode Island study:

The residents of the area had very low monthly incomes. This was particularly true of the aged. The major sources of income were social security, pensions, and, to a lesser extent, public assistance. Even among the younger persons, a high proportion relied upon public benefits. Thus, the area had a higher than average dependency level. Because of the particular sources of income, the income level has tended to remain quite stable. The fact that the level of income was low and held little prospect of increase contributed to the problems of a number of residents.

As we begin to consider the possible ways for the Congress to remedy the plight of the aging displaced by public land acquisition it is important to give due weight to each of the several ingredients that compound this complex problem.

But it is even more important that our first consideration be given to the needs of the aging people. And rather special people, at that.

For we are considering here the inevitable, the inescapable predicament of people who have a rich accumulation of skills, of life experience, and of know-how, which they can, want to, and should, share with their friends, neighbors, and fellow citizens.

My point is that, in its present study, your committee should first examine the human situation as a whole. Let me say that I am taking my text from a brilliant article on housing for older people by Lewis Mumford, published in the *Architectural Record* 6½ years ago (*Architectural Record*, vol. 119, No. 5 (May 1956), pp. 191-194).

The key to any remedial program lies, of course, in the economics of rehousing these displaced persons.

In the congressional choice of enactment of a suitable and effective program, it should be recognized that such a program may well include more than one remedy.

First of all, there is need to expand and reinforce the public housing program for the elderly folks eligible to take advantage of it. Our Federal Public Housing Commissioner, Mrs. Marie McGuire, during her service as a local public housing official in Texas, has pioneered in the field of public housing for the elderly in this country. Her experience and wise counsel can provide your committee with reliable guidelines for action in this area. She also contributed a very important chapter to a study by the National Brookings Institution for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is a study issued last January. I think this study should be given particular mention in the work of this committee. I have the study here on "Housing the Aging, Research Needs." It was edited with an over review by George W. Greer, by the Brookings Institution, and prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It was published in mimeographed form in January 1962.

In any event, I do hope that the committee in its studies will consult Mrs. McGuire, and tap her experience in this field.

Secondly, Congress should expand for this specific purpose the program authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended by the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962. This program authorizes direct loans to private nonprofit corporate sponsors of rental housing and of related facilities for elderly families and persons.

We recommend a specific addition to the loan funds authorized by these programs in order to make available housing needed to accommodate persons displaced as the result of public land acquisition.

In this connection, we strongly recommend that section 202 be further amended to permit local public housing authorities to sponsor section 202 projects where demonstrated need has been established and where no nonprofit or cooperative group is available to sponsor the needed housing.

It is also recommended that section 511 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, be further amended to increase adequately the amount available exclusively for assistance to elderly persons as provided in clause (3) of section 501(a).

Finally, we recommend, as the third, and the major approach to the special problem of rehousing the elderly persons displaced as the result of public acquisition of land, an entirely new program designed to enable these displaced persons to resettle in good, livable housing, suitable for their specific requirements.

This is a new proposal, Mr. Chairman, which I hope will receive very careful consideration by this committee.

We propose that, for this special purpose, a special program be enacted into law, to provide for rent supplementation to eligible elderly persons displaced as the result of public action, in order to enable them to rehouse themselves in suitable living quarters.

We recommend a program in which the Federal, State, and local governments would share, to enable the displaced elderly persons to meet the otherwise insurmountable costs of their forced resettlement.

In submitting the foregoing recommendations, let me emphasize that the AFL-CIO is keenly sensitive to the special need for housing for the elderly. Our fourth constitutional convention, held in December 1961, in its policy resolution on housing, stated :

Programs recently launched to provide decent housing at reasonable cost for elderly couples and individuals should be extended and expanded.

Taking cognizance of the contribution being made by labor unions, on a nonprofit and cooperative basis, to the development of needed housing for our senior citizens, the AFL-CIO 1961 housing resolution said further :

We would especially recommend to our affiliates or other groups sponsoring such housing that dwellings for the elderly should contain special features and equipment required by the elderly, including adequate community facilities and services and, insofar as possible, should also be integrated into the community as a whole.

Let me stress, right at the outset, the importance of this last point.

There is clear and indisputable evidence of unmet need for housing for the elderly people in our population. There is also evidence that to serve the needs of the elderly, such housing should include special features and be accompanied by special facilities.

We believe it would be wrong and socially unsound to encourage isolation of the older people into separate housing for the exclusive occupancy of the old people only.

On another vital point, the AFL-CIO policy resolution states :

The goal of equal housing opportunity for all Americans, long a key feature of labor's housing program, is still far from won. Millions of Negro and other minority families are denied equal access to the housing market by undemocratic discriminatory barriers based on race, color, creed, or national origin. Only in the relatively few States and local communities where fair housing practices laws have been enacted has even a beginning been made toward removing such discriminatory barriers. Other States and cities should follow this pattern, but real progress toward establishing fair housing practices will require vigorous action by the Federal Government.

We, therefore, ask that it be provided by law that Federal funds, credit, mortgage guarantees, or any type of financial assistance to construction or rental of any housing be provided only when such housing is available to all regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, without discrimination or segregation.

Let me now return to the consideration of the major program proposals I am submitting here today.

A vast and much needed program of highway construction is now underway. This program is being carried out under Federal legislation providing for the building, improvement, and extension, in cooperation with the several States, of roads on the Federal aid primary, secondary, and interstate highway systems and their urban extensions.

It seems untenable that public responsibility for the well-being of the people directly affected by these programs should end where the bulldozer begins its work.

The cost of social dislocation caused by technological and engineering progress must be included in the price of that progress.

It is both reasonable and proper that a fraction of the funds made available to carry out the Federal aid highway program be set aside to finance, in cooperation with the several States, a remedial rent-supplementation program for suitable rehousing of the elderly forcibly displaced by public condemnation and acquisition of land.

The Federal share of the cost of urban redevelopment and slum clearance, by the same token, should also include an allocation of funds, on a similar basis, for this purpose.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, in the case of public Federal building construction programs by the GSA, that also would apply. This problem of American DP's has been with us for some time.

For a nation that has so quickly and warmly responded to distress wrought by human upheavals abroad, it is high time for us to come to the aid of American displaced persons.

So let us, at least, begin, without delay, by making the needed provision of aid by helping those whose hardship is the greatest—the elderly displaced persons of America.

The problem before us, one with which we must effectively deal, is the result of gigantic strides made by our technology and engineering in serving the needs of the people of this Nation.

Let us now demonstrate that our capacity for social engineering is abreast of our advancing physical and mechanical technology. Let us prove that, under our American system, people deserve and receive the prior consideration.

Human lives, and above all the lives of our senior citizens, are not only precious in themselves, they also represent a lifelong accumulation of skills, experience, and know-how of incalculable value to our whole society. What we propose is a program of the highest order of conservation, a program of human conservation.

For what does it profit a man to conquer outer space and to lose his own home? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is an excellent statement. We are very grateful to you for a very significant contribution. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

Mr. FRANTZ. I wonder if you would comment a little bit further, sir, on your proposal for a rent-supplementation program and what you visualize there, how it would work, and what would be accomplished by it.

Mr. SHISHKIN. It seems to us there are two elements that have to be taken care of. One has been dealt with by another witness, with whom we agree, and that is the cost of displacement has to be aided, because it cannot be borne by many people, which includes the actual cost of moving sometimes, and the initial rent payments that have to be met

after resettlement. Certainly most importantly of all for the elderly we recommend this program of rent supplementation which would be shared with the State and local governments, the Federal-State kind of joint program in which when you do have highway programs that are part of the dislocation in a city, that the cost of rehousing, the cost of resettlement, becomes a fraction of the cost of the total program.

There are various formulas, 90-10 on Federal highway programs, which could well apply to this. It will be an integrated, going program. There will be no need for appropriation of special funds for this. It would include the needed rent supplementation from the cost of the highway construction or from the cost of construction of Federal buildings or urban renewal. This is essentially our proposal.

Mr. FRANTZ. This would be a payment to the individual displacee to enable him to rent housing at a higher rent?

Mr. SHISHKIN. That is correct. As far as the extent in time of this, you must remember we are proposing this for the rehousing of the elderly. So by definition on the actuarial tables, the limited nature of the program would be self-evident, because it would not be a payment of rent supplementation in perpetuity. It will be a limited one.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you again.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We hope very much that if the committee feels we can be of any help to you in the course of your study that you won't hesitate to call on us. We will stand ready to give you any assistance possible. This is a very important task and we should like to help.

Senator WILLIAMS. We appreciate your offer and undoubtedly we will be calling on you from time to time.

At this time I would like to insert in the record a letter from John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO.

(The letter referred to follows:)

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,  
Washington 6, D.C., October 24, 1962.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly, Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: For some years now when Boris Shishkin has appeared before committees of the Congress to testify on housing matters on behalf of AFL-CIO, he has made it a practice to invite me to accompany him and to offer such supplementary material as might be appropriate at that moment. On this occasion I am unable to appear with Mr. Shishkin because I am required to attend the quarterly executive council meeting of the Textile Workers Union of America which is being held this year in Montreal, Canada. Please accept herewith this very brief statement on behalf of the Textile Workers Union of America and of myself as an elderly houser vigorously supporting the position taken by the AFL-CIO and by Mr. Shishkin.

Our older citizens, by and large, have become one of the most neglected, one of the most shamefully wasted social assets of our modern day society. If, in our urban areas, we would make reasonable and fitting provision for these senior men and women who, for whatever reason, have been physically or socially dislocated, or who have been shelved for lack of intelligent community leadership, we would bring back into our lives an ingredient or a quality which has been sadly lacking. No one, whether old or middle aged, will seriously dispute for a moment that in our neighborhoods, our community organizations, our political

and social life, the leadership of today must come mainly from our younger people. On the other hand, no family and no other social grouping can be truly balanced in the kind of contribution it can make to society unless both the older and the younger members are not merely allowed to offer the best that is them but all age groupings must be urged and expected to give the fullest that their experience and maturity enable them to offer to their relatives, their neighbors, and all other fellow human beings.

Recently I had an opportunity to visit one of the so-called new towns that the British Government is building to enable several hundred thousand Londoners to live and work in healthier, more attractive, more sensible surroundings. Completely new, very carefully planned communities are being built on what was raw farmland. Each of these new towns is to have a population of about 85,000. This experiment is proving so successful that some (I feel) unwise persons are advocating that the size of these cities be doubled. The point I observed on this recent visit which is relevant to this discussion is the way in which the community I had the opportunity to observe plans for its older members. Twenty or more years ago when England first undertook the first of such experiments, the older people, and indeed some of the younger ones too, ran back to the slum areas from which they came because they were lonely and felt useless and ill at ease in their lovely new surroundings. Today all this has changed.

Positive steps have been taken to integrate the older folks into each neighborhood and into the community as a whole. The retired or elderly are not segregated; they are not pushed off on the side; they are not just given a nice place to sit in which they are expected to be quiet. No, indeed. First of all, these people are given proper places to live in, flats, cottages, or row houses fitted to their needs and tastes. They are charged rents which they can afford. Subsidies are provided when and if this should be necessary. If physical disabilities develop, the older people are looked after. But the principal thing to me was the way they are made part of the community life; they are not merely treated with respect and regard—they are expected to contribute their wisdom, patience, and whatever else life has enabled them to offer to the total community welfare. True, there are certain days, at the neighborhood center when the older people have their own affairs—just as the children and the younger marrieds have theirs. But on all broad community activities, the old, the young, the middle aged all work together, play together, and help each other in whatever way circumstances and individual desires may indicate. The result of all this was that the social well being of these new towns is unusually high; the statistics prove it; anyone with a sharp eye can see this for himself.

The point that should be made in this testimony, I believe, apropos of what I saw in this British new town is that relocation of the elderly, while an urgent and elementary necessity, must be handled with special care and special skill. The most inspired kind of planning must go into whatever solutions are to be offered to these older people who have been forced out of homes and neighborhoods—often where they have lived most of their lives. Manifestly it is not enough to quickly slot these displacees of advanced age into just any place that is merely warm and clean. We must insure much more than that; we must provide a whole environment into which these persons can readily fit themselves—an environment where they will not only be welcome but where they will be wanted and where they will be useful and, indeed, needed.

We urge that your subcommittee stress these phases of the problem and insist that the agencies which will become responsible for carrying out the relocations will bear in mind the considerations touched on in this very brief declaration.

We hope that it might be feasible to have an opportunity at some later date to go into this part of the whole problem in a more adequate manner. For the moment, permit us to thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing and to express our earnest support of the principal testimony by Mr. Shishkin on behalf of our parent body.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. EDELMAN,  
*Washington Representative*

(For the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO).

We now recess until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon at 12:30 p.m., a recess was taken until 2 p.m., the same day.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p.m., Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will resume the hearings with the opportunity to hear from Mrs. Jane Jacobs, well-known as author, and formerly associate editor of Architectural Forum and once in a while in the news like today in the New York Times.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. JANE JACOBS, AUTHOR, FORMERLY  
ASSOCIATE EDITOR, ARCHITECTURAL FORUM**

Mrs. JACOBS. I was jumped on there today.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Temko and you are in a little disagreement, I guess. We are highly honored, Mrs. Jacobs.

Mrs. JACOBS. It is very nice of you to have me here and I appreciate the opportunity. Mr. Moskowitz was considerate enough to tell me that I need not have a prepared statement so I will speak from notes. I hope that is all right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Perfectly all right. As a matter of fact, it is refreshing.

Mrs. JACOBS. This room and the things that I heard this morning are so remote from any real life that I know, that I may be kind of a jarring note here. I am sorry if so, but the only thing I can do is say the way it looks to me and what I have seen. I am particularly interested in this problem right now because of one particular project in New York, and I think it sums up many of the things and many of the same implications and effects of other projects. I will use it as an example to begin with. I don't think it is unique. I think it is almost a caricature of what is going on. This one happens to be a highway and it is called the Lower Manhattan Expressway.

Here I must disagree with the general assumption that I kept hearing this morning: that these projects always represent progress, are necessary, and so forth. I don't believe this is so. I don't believe we have been discriminating enough about them.

I think a lot of people, including the elderly, are being thrown into caldrons for projects which are not beneficial and will, in fact, be very harmful to a lot of the people besides the ones they are dislocating.

This particular project is going to be the most expensive highway ever built. I believe someone mentioned to me the other day that \$20 million a mile was about the most expensive. This one is going to cost a minimum of a hundred million dollars for 2½ miles. It is actually going to be more; the official figure of a hundred million was given almost 2 years ago.

This doesn't include the accesses, and so forth—more than \$40 million a mile. It is going to dislocate 2,000 families, 800 businesses that employ 10,000 people, 14 schools, churches, and other public institutions.

Scranton, Pa., where I come from, has been trying to pull itself up by its bootstraps for years, and the net result of this is, after years of effort, that they have gotten new industries in there that have jobs for about 10,000 people. This 2½ miles of highway in

downtown Manhattan is going to knock out that many jobs at one blow.

The fascinating thing about this is that it is never presented in the papers as a Federal interstate highway. It is always presented as a device for alleviating local traffic. It is actually Highway 78. It is the same highway that the mayor of Newark, Mr. Addonizio, is fighting. It is the kind of highway we are going to see, as you mentioned this morning, Senator, many, many more of in our cities.

This is the first one of its kind for Manhattan. Mr. Moses says that it will be followed by at least three more similar. It will have to be. It is the beginning of the Los Angelizing of New York. It is a Federal highway going right through the most congested part of the New Jersey-Manhattan-Brooklyn metropolitan area, precisely where I think these major arteries should never go. They should be bypasses. This is what we are going to get, though, unless policy is changed on these matters.

We are going to get an awful lot of it in the next few years. Now, as usual, there are many elderly people among these 2,000 households that are going to be displaced by this highway. There is no amount of money, there is no device that you can do with money, that can really solve this problem of what it is going to do to these old people. I am not going to mention a lot of the things that are only too obvious—the way it tears them loose by their roots and they will never get rooted again.

As a matter of fact, that makes the relocation of the elderly perhaps the easiest of all relocation problems, because it kills so many and then they are not relocation problems any longer.

In addition to this tearing them loose, there are a great many hardships of relocation itself that never seem to be mentioned by officials, and yet they must know about them. In New York City, to get people out, including old people, a great many rather nasty things are done. Heat is sent up into the apartments in August—intolerable heat. Heat is kept from the apartments in February. Fires somehow break out when some of the apartments are empty. Empty apartments are flooded, and the water runs down into the other ones.

These are common things in New York City. Everybody who has relatives or friends who have been in relocation areas knows about these. They are never mentioned officially. The elderly people, that we hear such tender concern for, are subjected to this kind of thing. It is the only way of getting them out, often. They are so tenacious at sticking in their neighborhoods.

Here we come to differences in definition of what is a good neighborhood. We keep hearing about substandard conditions. These projects, including the highways, are supposed to be running through substandard areas. There are various reasons for deterioration of these areas that I will mention in a little while.

There is quite a different sense of values at work here as to what is a deteriorated or a bad area, and what is standard or good. In this particular area, for 20 years it has had a shadow of relocation of some sort, a renewal of some sort hanging over it. It has been put on a slum clearance map for that long. In all that time, as you mentioned this morning, there has been no money available. Yet that neighborhood (it is called Little Italy) has held together. It has a very low crime



rate. It has a very low delinquency rate. It has a very stable population. It draws a great many tourists who see a good deal of joy in the area.

These are all values that somehow or another are not taken into account. The standard and good—supposedly good, housing—improved conditions, that show up on statistics as improved places into which the people are to be moved, are projects in which people are afraid to go out at night. In Little Italy you can walk the streets at 3 in the morning and have no fear. In the “improved” housing, the projects to which the people are supposed to be relocated, the elevators have such a stench you can hardly go into them. It is worth your life to go out at night by yourself.

Indeed, conditions of danger are so bad they came rather to a crisis this summer in the city. We must be suspicious of these statistics that say so and so many people bettered their condition. Who says it is better? What are the components of what is better?

These are things that have to be inquired into. Then there is the matter of cost. In this particular area the average rent per room per month is \$10.57. The lowest public housing rents are \$14 per room per month, \$3.50 more for something the people consider not as good.

There is the problem of whether relocation housing actually is available. We had a hearing on this expressway back in June, and one of the speakers called up by the administration to speak was the Deputy Commissioner of Real Estate in Charge of Relocation. He told how housing would be available for these 2,000 households that were to be put out, and he named various public projects in which apartments would be available, ones nearing completion or ones being planned.

Statistically, at least, it sounded as if there would be apartments available. A couple of weeks later there was another hearing on the upper west side urban renewal project. There was the deputy commissioner of real estate saying the same speech again. He was promising the same apartments. The very same ones in the very same projects were going to make it possible to relocate the people in the upper west side urban renewal project.

He was asked in the hall outside of the hearing room about this. “How can you promise the same apartments for two different projects?” At which he shrugged his shoulders and said, “How do I know who will move into them?”

This is not what relocation is on paper, but it is what it is in real life in New York City. From what people tell me in Chicago and in St. Louis and in Boston and Pittsburgh, it is not too different there, either. This is not just a matter of the elderly.

Perhaps we feel more guilty about what is happening to the elderly. We should feel a great deal of guilt about what is happening to the children, too. The elderly are just one facet of a great shaking up and pushing around that bears no relationship to how it is supposed to work.

Speaking of the elderly in particular, I would like to mention one thing that I haven't heard brought up and that is the matter of stores run by elderly people. In older sections of the city, and in dense sections of our cities, a great many small stores like candy stores, newspaper stores, notion stores, that kind of thing, are run by elderly people.

Whenever the question of relocation of these businesses comes up, the standard response of the planners is that they are not making a good living out of these places anyway. They are not making much money. It is inefficient in terms of the hours they put in and the monetary return they get, and also the very fact that they are elderly, the implication being that they would not be running the stores many more years anyway. They will die, they will get too old, and this is maybe just a little premature demise of these stores.

Again, in real life, this is not the way it is. We have a number of these stores in our neighborhood. They are perpetually run by elderly people. When the elderly people running them get too old or die, the stores of this kind are taken over by other fairly elderly people. They are the kind of stores that are bought by people who have been wage earners, very likely, all their lives, and have saved up a little and had this dream of having a little business of their own. They don't make much money at it. They keep busy at it. They make enough to get by and they do a wonderful service for the neighborhood, partly because they are not primarily interested in earning money. Primarily because they have had this dream of having a little business and being part of the works.

The kind of relocation, the kind of projects we are having now, there is no room for any such occupation of the elderly in the new city, the new city of the projects, the new city of urban renewal. There is a similar thing that lots of elderly people do in our neighborhoods without buying a store, and that is they act as public characters. They are busybodies around the place. They keep themselves watching things, reprimanding the little kids, spreading the news, communicating, and so forth. This is a great service to city neighborhoods.

Now it is very ironic when you see the housing built, particularly for the aged. There are golden age centers. There are young people whose whole life work is to try to keep the elderly busy. They are at their wits ends about it. It doesn't work very well. It is futile. It is made work. It is boondoggling. It is busy work. We remove the old people from neighborhoods where they have genuine work to do and where they are genuinely useful and put them in places where we then have to begin to employ young people to create activities that everyone knows is a hoax.

The old people in areas that are being subjected to urban renewal and to highways like this Lower Manhattan Expressway can't fight very well. They go down to city hall if they are able to get down there, but they are not the real fighters. They depend on younger people to fight for them. It is very affecting. They want you to fight for them.

You get an idea how much this means to them, how much they do oppose dislocation, and how nothing can make it up to them, from the way they grasp your arm in the streets and tell you "be strong, fight hard" and that kind of thing. They cry sometimes. It is very sad. I don't see how money can ever make up for it. Now I think a lot of it is unnecessary. I think most of it is unnecessary.

I think that a great deal of the cause of this unnecessary fruitless suffering is right here in Washington. For one thing, the kind

of regulations that our nationally financed programs demand. I will mention one type. You asked a question about it this morning, Senator.

It is the rehabilitation program which was supposed to be so good. I can tell you, I think, why that is not working. Do you want me to go into that?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mrs. JACOBS. Mr. David Carlson of the Architectural Forum went down to see the pilot project in Baltimore where this rehabilitation program was to have its first big demonstration. He went down several times. He studied it quite a bit. He told me about it.

Here is what he told me: The pilot area that was picked out in Baltimore for this rehabilitation program had the benefit of a task force from FHA, of either 10 or 12 men. I forget which now. It was one or the other, for 6 weeks. After the 6 weeks was over, the task force was cut in half and 8 weeks later they were still working at it.

David said that they may still be there. He thinks the windowman is probably there permanently. Here is what they were doing: Because these rehabilitation loans are to be guaranteed by the FHA, they had a big, fat FHA rule book all full of fine print about the regulations and the standards that must be met to get an FHA guarantee.

I will backtrack just a moment here. Back to the Upper West Side urban renewal project in New York. When the pictures came out, the demonstration pictures, and drawings of how those side streets were going to be improved under rehabilitation, I was amazed to see that all the stoops were off the buildings and a kind of standardized window had been put in all the buildings. It looked very miserable and I thought, "Oh, dear, that is their awful taste and their affinity for ugliness and lack of character, coming out here," and I let it go at that.

I was very wrong. This kind of thing is actually required under the rehabilitation program of HHFA, and in the Baltimore pilot project area, they ran head on into this. For one thing, stoops are not allowed in this fine print. That is why they are off in the Upper West Side urban renewal. It is not that people like or don't like stoops, or the houses would be better without them.

This is part of the fine print that comes from right here in Washington. That was the first problem that the pilot program met in Baltimore—what to do about the stoops. You can't take the stoops off in Baltimore. So it took a lot of redoing of the fine print and a lot of new fine print about the height of the risers and how many steps there could be.

Then there came the problem of railings. They have been getting along without stoop railings in Baltimore for generations. This took not only writing about stoops but all the stairs that turn up in all the fine print. You have to go into that.

Then there is the matter of doors. The doors have to be a certain size. The doors inside the place. It doesn't matter if they fit the doorways, but the doors have to be a certain size. That is in the fine print. Then there is square feet of area that it takes to qualify as a room, and there is square feet of window space as a ratio to square feet of room space.

This goes on and on and on. After 6 weeks, they had the print about the stoops straightened out and the railings straightened out except they made a blooper because the two most historic houses in the pilot area, it turned out, were going to have to have railings on the stoops because when they had the fine print written they had eliminated railings for only certain heights of stoops, a certain number of steps. Beyond that you had to have a railing. It turned out this is going to be a horrible historical violation. The last I heard they had not really resolved that one.

The last that my friend David Carlson heard, the windowman was still bogged down. That was 14 weeks later. He was saying, it is horrible, no two windows here are the same size.

David said to them, "Look, after you get all this done, what you are going to have is a set of rules that will permit you to insure rehabilitation money in this one pilot area in Baltimore. It is not even going to be very good for other parts of Baltimore and it is not going to be any good at all for other cities. What about that?"

So they shrugged. He said, "Are you going to try to do this kind of thing anywhere they are going to lend rehabilitation money? If you are going to do this, this will take you 2,000 years to spend just the money that has been allocated. How about that?"

They shrugged their shoulders and said, "Well, that is the way it is." And, gentlemen, that is the way it is. The moneylenders have a great deal to answer for in what has been happening to our cities, but I don't believe they are at fault in this one. Our own HHFA, our own accumulated ideology of fine-print regulations in this kind of thing, is at fault here.

When you do rehabilitation in this fashion it is terribly expensive. When you have to change the window sizes and door sizes and cut off the stoops, and go in for all this kind of nonsense that has nothing whatever to do with good living or is it a decent place to live or not, it becomes a very high rent thing.

That is why renewal areas like Society Hill turn out to be really just for high-rent people. That is why this talk about "not the bulldozer approach, we will leave a good many buildings and rehabilitate them," means it is the bulldozer for the people, in general. It is only very high income people who can afford this kind of rehabilitation.

Where it is done with subsidies—we have a sample of four of them in New York, subsidized public housing—the buildings were completely gutted. They had to be to conform to the public regulations. It was terribly expensive. It doesn't add up to as good building or as attractive looking as what there was before.

Another kind of regulation is making a lot of unnecessary suffering. These are the regulations—they go with our whole urban renewal and our public housing programs—for open land, for leaving high proportions of the grounds open. It means that in any project, to fill out the site, as it is said, you have to take out a lot of things that you wouldn't have to otherwise. You have to throw out a lot of people and old people that you wouldn't otherwise. They often see that this is wrong. Even the local officials, and particularly the elected officials, deplore this.

No, it is too bad, but what can they do? This is set for them, in Washington. Again, coming back to the highways, why are we having

this Lower Manhattan Expressway through New York, this Highway 78? Because that is the only kind of highway you can get this 90 percent of Federal funds for.

Really something quite different needs to be done about the traffic in lower Manhattan. Something that wouldn't create this mass havoc, but it wouldn't conform to the many, many regulations for what is a good interstate highway. Therefore, it wouldn't entail getting \$90 million from the Federal Government.

So the intelligent thing is not going to be done. If anything is done, it will be the thing that will get the \$90 million from the Federal Government.

Senator WILLIAMS. How do they propose to take that across the river?

Mrs. JACOBS. This is very interesting. The part of it in New York—in Manhattan, rather—runs from the Holland Tunnel over to the Williamsburg and Manhattan Bridges. The reason that there are bad traffic conditions down there, as anybody can see if they just go down any weekday, any time—I am not talking about the Sunday night jam-up, that is famous—any weekday during working hours, all you need to do is walk down there and look and see what is jamming up traffic, and it is the backup of cars going into the tunnel.

So this 10-lane highway costing a hundred million is going to be built and it is going to be the biggest elevated traffic jam in the world. It has nothing to do with the problem.

I suspect that what will happen is that this will then be used to parlay a new tunnel tube, which the Federal Government will pay for. Then I suspect what will happen, or what is bound to happen, is that there will be more cars and more cars dumped into New York where they don't belong and we will get a great clamoring for the 30th Street Expressway, and we will get all the compounding and piling up of traffic problems that result from trying to dump traffic into the very congested heart of a city.

Going over to the Brooklyn side, there is the same kind of jam-ups at the two bridges there, the Williamsburg and Manhattan Bridges. They will probably be double-decked eventually at the expense of the Federal Government.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are they capable of that?

Mrs. JACOBS. I don't know whether they are or not. The George Washington was designed for that.

Senator WILLIAMS. It was planned for that?

Mrs. JACOBS. I don't think anybody has even looked to see what they are going to do. They just see that 90 million bucks and the 10 million from the State government, and it is too good to be true, and we will worry about what happens next, later.

In Brooklyn this Highway 78 is called the Bushwick Expressway. Almost nothing is ever mentioned about it because if it were you would have 10,000 families in Brooklyn fighting this, too, as well as the people in Manhattan. What will happen if we don't succeed in killing this in Manhattan, it will be approved and then the city will have to approve the Bushwick Expressway because it is part of the same highway and the city won't get the hundred million if it doesn't go through with the rest of it. So it builds up.

Mayor Addonizio wrote a letter to Mayor Wagner about this problem because he is fighting the same highway in Newark. It is going to go through one of the best areas of Newark. He says mayors of the cities ought to get together about what is happening to them. I don't know what happened about this, whether he got any response or not.

I happened to know about this letter. It was never published, although it was given to a paper, I understand. The lack of information as to what these highways mean in our dense cities is just appalling. They will be upon us and this is the phase, as Senator Williams said this morning, that is going to do the most havoc, dislocate the most people, and do what I call Los Angelesizing our cities. The paucity of information, just sheer hard news as to what is happening, is really quite frightening.

I would suggest among other things that if you want to help on relocation in Washington you ought to reexamine these aid programs. As soon as you give aid money from here, that is what is going to be built, whether it is the right thing or not.

I think before the highway program's full force is felt in our metropolitan areas, it ought to be reassessed. In a way we are lucky that the cities, the hardest part, have been the latest.

I would suggest in the public housing and the urban renewal programs you ought to consider removing regulations from here in Washington. You are not doing any good with these regulations. They had the best will in the world behind them, that jerry built things should not be permitted and everybody should be uplifted by them. But I think it would be a great improvement if the only regulations applying were the building codes and the local regulations in the cities themselves. Then we would not run into things like this crazy rehabilitation business.

We will never get anywhere with rehabilitation until all the regulations from Washington are taken off and FHA guarantees are given for anything that will meet the building codes and regulations of the cities concerned. And why not? If it is good enough for the private building, if it is good enough for the general public of the city, it ought to be good enough for the ones being backed by the Federal Government.

Senator WILLIAMS. Shouldn't that rehabilitation stress, and perhaps stress almost exclusively, safety and sanitary requirements?

Mrs. JACOBS. Absolutely. Of course, that is what city building codes do.

Senator WILLIAMS. Except in some towns where you have to have white houses and black shutters?

Mrs. JACOBS. That is right. I see no reason whatever to go into for anything more than the city codes. The irony is that the net result of applying these regulations is uglier streets and more characterless buildings and neighborhoods than without applying the regulations. We are not getting more beautiful cities in this way. We are getting barracks.

Another thing that I would suggest that you do here that would minimize the relocation problem, minimize the need for urban renewal, is look into this whole question of blacklisting—loan blacklisting—of city areas.

I don't think anybody can do this except the Federal Government. I don't think anybody is going to get anywhere with this except possibly Senate investigation. This is the single most destructive force, I think, in our cities today, this loan blacklisting of areas so they cannot be improved. You touched on one aspect of this this morning when you said when an area is designated as blighted they don't get any more loans. That is perfectly true.

Sometimes, as in the case of this little Italy neighborhood I have spoken of, this can last 20 years. It is a marvel when a neighborhood keeps together and keeps its crime rate, delinquency rate down, keeps loyalty of people, gets apartments improved, amazingly, on a shoe-string on the inside, while the buildings go to pot. We ought to be admiring an area like that and realizing how strong it is.

Besides the blacklisting that occurs because an area has been officially designated as blighted, certain areas are picked out for blacklisting by lending institutions, often because Negro families have moved in. It is no accident that a disproportionate number of people being relocated are elderly and are Negro. These are areas that can't help themselves. They are deteriorating because it is impossible to get money in them for improvement.

I am not speaking about banks or insurance companies or savings and loan associations which look at a loan risk and make the judgment, this is not a good risk for us. I am talking about something much more formal, an actual concerted agreement among all the lending agencies not to lend into a certain area. This goes on all the time.

It is something analogous, I would think, to a conspiracy in restraint of trade. It is a monopoly action on a certain commodity—mortgage money. How these blacklists are applied, how the areas are chosen, how they are enforced, I think is something that can only be found by investigation and I think any legislation to attempt to correct this would have to have a background of information of that kind.

I hope that sometime this will be looked into here in Washington. We can expect automatic deterioration of many of our city areas unless this thing is corrected.

This morning Mr. Rafsky made the suggestion that as soon as a place is designated for a highway or for urban renewal, it would be fine to have immediate relocation so that people who would get out could be gotten out as fast as possible. I would certainly urge caution on that. I think it would open these programs to even more abuse than at present.

In the real world, a guy wants to make money out of an urban renewal project. According to law it has to be a deteriorating area, but he is not liable to make very much money out of his project in a genuinely deteriorating area. As my husband says, what he needs is a slum in a good area. You see what I mean?

So a definition is very much forced as to what is a bad area. With the way things are now, people can do a certain amount of fighting and they are learning to fight a little better. You keep stacking the cards against them, making relocation begin to operate the moment after designation, before the various hearings have to be gone through, before the various plans have to be approved, it is going to be a setup for people who want a finger in an area and get it good and fast. I would be very cautious about that kind of thing.

Behind our troubles of the regulations, the kind of aid money we are getting, the unnecessary relocation, are an awful lot of misconceptions about cities. I have listed a few of these here but I don't know whether you want me to go into them. I think I probably talked too long already.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is not that. We always seem to have a fine problem. I have a speech to make in Camden and one later in Baltimore. It has been most helpful. I am going to send this statement of yours on to another committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, Housing Subcommittee, which has legislation that proposes one of the answers to 10-lane highways in New York—a better mass transportation system.

Mrs. JACOBS. Absolutely.

Senator WILLIAMS. To find a slum in a good area is a good way of putting it. Like the baseball manager who tells the pitcher, "Don't give him anything good but get that ball over."

Mrs. JACOBS. Yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. If I may, I have one or two questions for Mrs. Jacobs. As I understand some of the things you have been talking and writing about the public housing officials have been tampering with things that are very important to the vitality of the neighborhood, especially to the older citizen by tearing down existing neighborhoods which offer existing facilities.

It not only destroys the block patterns but the businesses that are necessary and other environmental things in the neighborhood. On the other hand, and this is the point of the question, we do have to recognize that in these areas there is substandard housing, isn't that true?

Mrs. JACOBS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. The housing does not meet minimum sanitary requirements. As I understand their argument as opposed to your view, we have to improve the standards of housing. You seem to offer no alternative. You don't feel that the housing should stay as it is, do you?

Mrs. JACOBS. No. But it is a fallacy that we have only two alternatives—let things run down and continue to use bad housing or to go into this great blanket sort of approach. These are not the two alternatives. They are not handed down by God.

If you listen to what people in neighborhoods say, they are asking for something very, very valid and very sensible. They are saying we want better housing without our neighborhood being destroyed. They are not asking for projects. They are asking for better housing.

If we get rid of the project concept, if we would just start building buildings instead of projects and if buildings need conform only to the codes and regulations of the city, not to something special and presumably more uplifting, we could get new buildings without destroying whole neighborhoods.

Gradually you put some here and some there, the way private building sometimes goes on, where it goes on in cities. Mix it up gradually with rehabilitation and you also wouldn't have this fallacy of what I call simultaneous uplift. The notion that a whole area has got to be uplifted at once. Real life is not like that. It is not necessary.



We do need Government subsidies for buildings but that is a very different matter from saying the Government has to own the buildings. Maybe they do, maybe they don't. It is a very different matter from saying there have to be urban renewal projects. There are a lot of different ways of doing it.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Then one other question along this line. I think one of your criticisms has been that in Government-owned buildings or public housing there is a stigma attached to people, especially older citizens. They are very much opposed to moving to a project because of the stigma.

Would the stigma still be attached if there were subsidies? It is obvious there has to be some supplementation.

Mrs. JACOBS. Yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Do you have any comment on that?

Mrs. JACOBS. We have lots of subsidies to which no stigma is attached and I think the stigma comes from making people feel stigmatized. In our public housing, as it is at present, nearly every kind of device that could be thought up to attack a person's dignity and pride is used.

The manager or his minions can walk into any apartment at any time. A private landlord cannot do that without a by your leave. Much is made of the fact that if your income gets too high you are going to be put out. This makes you feel psychologically that you are either a transient or a failure. You have to be one or the other.

Management does a lot of things in public housing that maybe private landlords would like to do but if private landlords do it you can get the Government at them.

When your Government is your landlord you are stuck. When the Government is arrogant to you, there is no one else to turn to. I think that has a lot to do with the feeling of stigma and the feeling of helplessness and resentment.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. The Senator alluded to the article in this morning's New York Times. Do you want to make any comment on Mr. Temko saying that he also expresses scorn "for the new urban sentimentality of Jane Jacobs and others who are really arguing for a spruced up status quo."

Mrs. JACOBS. I don't think he understands what I have written or what I said. I don't think it is sentimental to be interested in how things work. I think it is quite the opposite. I think we have to know how things work if we are going to tinker with them, and we have to know how cities work.

This means a lot of observation, and a lot of attention to the status quo, and a recognition that you begin with the status quo, by definition, because that is what is there, and you begin improving it and enhancing what is good in it and trying to counteract what is bad. And to know what is good and what is bad you have to know really how it is working, not in an imaginary way.

I don't think this is sentimental. I guess Mr. Temko does. I think that the notion of waving magic wands, and everything being awfully futuristic and glamorous all of a sudden, has gotten us into a lot of trouble, esthetically as well as functionally.

Senator WILLIAMS. He suggested yesterday that a few blocks of Sixth Avenue be put underground. There is a subway down there. I would hate to see them cut that part of the subway out.

Mrs. JACOBS. That is a small detail. If you care about the subway being there, then you are just trying to refurbish the status quo.

Mr. FRANTZ. Mrs. Jacobs, you mentioned a couple of the programs which have difficulties that are traceable to an excess of Federal regulation.

What would you say about the relocation function in the programs that we have; that we have less regulation from the Federal level or more regulation?

Mrs. JACOBS. I think it is rather irrelevant, because the Federal regulations on relocation amount to the city having to submit on paper—at least this is the way it works in New York—a relocation plan, and having to have what is called a workable program. This is very much on paper. It can bear no relationship to reality. There can be the darnedest housing shortage as there is in New York, particularly for Negroes, and yet on paper, for every project, including those in which large numbers of Negroes are being displaced, there will be what appears to be a relocation plan.

Statistically it will be justified. This is hokey. When people, who are victimized by this, appeal to HHFA, as they often do, they are told that, because of the Federal Government's great faith in local government, the Federal Government will not look behind what the local governments have submitted.

This has been going on for a good many years now. I think it is fairly irrelevant what relocation regulations you make or don't make. They are going to do what they want, what they feel able to, and the HHFA is not going to look behind it. This is a very different case, incidentally, from the way the FHA does go behind every little item on these rehabilitation things.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I believe Mr. Frantz' question is that in this area there may be a need for more regulation, and you agree. If the requirements of the relocation plan just deal with the number of housing units and a few other minimum requirements they are not sufficient.

Mrs. JACOBS. Perhaps they are not sufficient but they are not even being, such as they are, truthfully fulfilled.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I bring it down now to the specific question of discrimination, where units may be available but may not be in actual reality because of certain discriminatory practice. This may take other regulation.

On the one hand you say there may be too many regulations but don't you think there may be a need for more in this area?

Mrs. JACOBS. When people dislocated by two different projects are promised the same relocation housing and this goes into the Federal Government as part of the workable plan, no amount of regulation is going to help that kind of thing.

The city feels pretty safe in doing that, actually, because they know that only the people who absolutely have no other choice are going to take this relocation housing that is being offered in public housing projects?

Anybody whose income is high enough will probably leave the city once they are being booted out of their neighborhood. A lot of people, rather than go into projects, will find some other kind of housing and maybe overcrowd themselves somewhere else. So they know, actually, not all of those people will show up for those apartments. But they will send in the program that they have these apartments. They will be duplicated.

The Federal Government won't look behind that. How is more regulation going to help on that? It is dishonest, what is being done. What you need is more enforcement of some kind of honest compliance with the relocation regulations that you do have, before you add more of them, I would say.

Senator WILLIAMS. That has been a very stimulating part of our hearings. We are very grateful to you.

Mrs. JACOBS. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Don't let them take Greenwich Village away. They tried to take it away one night.

Mrs. JACOBS. The Lower Manhattan Expressway will put 11 ramps between Varick and the Bowery. That is right in the heart of Manhattan. Five of six will go to the north, which is Greenwich Village. That big fight we had in Washington Square, some years ago, was a premature fight against the road from one of those ramps. Just that one has been taken out.

Senator WILLIAMS. What cities in Europe are you most fond of that you think are making the best changes?

Mrs. JACOBS. I am totally incompetent to answer about that because I have not been abroad.

Senator WILLIAMS. I am going to be over there and I would like to improve my time. Should I go to Mr. Temko?

Mrs. JACOBS. You can ask him, but I think there are better authorities.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much. Now we have a couple of planners around here to help us with our dislocation and relocation problems of the elderly—W. C. Dutton and Jerome L. Kaufman.

#### **STATEMENT OF JEROME L. KAUFMAN, PRINCIPAL PLANNER, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS**

Mr. KAUFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jerome Kaufman, and I am a principal planner on the staff of the American Society of Planning officials, a nonprofit professional organization founded in 1934 whose concern is the fostering of the best techniques and decisions for the planned development of communities and regions.

Our organization is supported in large part by over 700 public and private planning agencies who subscribe to our research and technical services.

We are, therefore, in an excellent position to gage the ongoing interests, activities, and concerns of the majority of planning agencies in the United States.

Planning for all age groups is then an inviolable principle. In practice, however, city planners have been unduly preoccupied with certain age groups. Like the postwar housing boom the approach to

community development and planning has been child and family centers. Spurred on by the realization that the aged comprise a larger and larger proportion of the total population, by the profusion of Federal programs that have been recently adopted to augment the housing supply for older persons and by the concerted efforts of local welfare councils and committees on aging, city planners have begun in the past few years to more closely investigate the special problems and needs of the elderly population.

They are starting to help to find answers to a variety of questions. What qualities of a community make it more livable for older persons? Should a dispersal or concentration of older citizens be encouraged as a matter of community policy? Should zoning and subdivision control regulations be modified to accommodate special housing developments for the elderly? Should local policy encourage the building of special housing units for the elderly or encourage the increase of their economic capacity to compete for housing in the existing market? How should the elderly be accommodated in urban renewal, both in terms of displacement and the provision of new services?

Two related events are occurring in the field of relocation that are moving Government to act more responsibly in developing and administering relocation programs.

First, the number of families forced to move as a result of the several public programs is growing. Perhaps the number annually dislocated by residential renewal activity has leveled out as a result of the shift from clearance to conservation activity. Nonetheless, the overall total has risen as new expressways and freeways lace the community and as more residential sites are condemned and cleared for industrial and institutional renewal purposes.

Second, there is a growing concern that the relocation notion should be expanded and thought of in larger terms, not just as another phase in the renewal operation but as a program in its own right. Families, relocated two or three times from blighted areas, separate relocation operations for renewal and highway development programs and the recognition that relocation is often more an emotional than a rehousing problem are forcing a careful appraisal of existing relocation efforts.

All those discommoded by public action are inconvenienced, to some extent, with some groups the aged, large families, non-whites being unduly inconvenienced. Although my remarks are especially directed to the problems of the elderly, reflecting the particular interest of this subcommittee, I would like to point out that the discussion and recommendations offered in many respects are applicable as well for other groups, the difference being one of degree and kind.

My 75-year-old grandfather has a penchant for shifting about the city, moving from apartment to apartment, rarely staying in one place for more than a few months. I suspect he would be able to get over the effects of being involuntarily relocated much easier than 95 percent of the older population. He is essentially rootless, still quite active, and probably secretly relishes the prospect of moving once again; it gives him something to do. Other elderly persons are equally mobile; forced to move because of clearance, some might pick themselves up easily and move, for example, to a planned retirement community in the South or far West.

Enough studies have been undertaken to indicate, however, that the bulk of the elderly population encounters much greater difficulties when faced with the prospect of forced eviction. Older persons tend to live longer in their present units than the rest of the population, thus developing a strong emotional attachment to their homes and neighborhoods. Even when elderly persons have few social contacts, studies show that movement out of a familiar area often means the serious disruption of an established way of life which they want to maintain.

It is a known fact that the aged have more difficulty in adapting to new physical surroundings. In view of the older person's limited financial resources, the cost of moving and renting new quarters often at a higher price is also a more serious obstacle.

Obviously, these general findings point up the need for a careful go-slow approach in relocating elderly persons. Cities are committed to action and change if they wish to survive as vital entities. This requirement causes disruptions in the conduct of human life—the necessity to relocate people from their familiar surroundings being an example.

The task then becomes infinitely more complex: To minimize individual hardship and maximize the chance for productive and stable life within the broader context of moving ahead as a community. In other words, we must reconcile the larger community goals with the narrower goals of the individual. As a first step in assessing the impact of involuntary relocation on the elderly communities we should have a reasonably accurate picture of the magnitude of the problem anticipated. How many older persons will be dislocated because of governmental action? What are their general characteristics in terms of household size, income, employment status, and health conditions? What is the ability of the housing market to satisfactorily rehouse these persons?

In some communities, the number of older persons to be displaced may be quite high. Over 13 percent of the population of Minneapolis is 65 years of age and over. The city, by the way, ranks first among the 25 largest U.S. cities in terms of the percent of population 65 and over. According to a recent study by the Minneapolis Planning Commission, close to 60 percent of the city's oldest residents, about 30,000 people, live in areas subject to either conservation, rehabilitation, or clearance treatment.

Thus, large numbers of older persons may be forced to move from their present quarters as the result of renewal activity. The pattern of most of the elderly citizens being concentrated in older parts of the city is fairly common in many communities. Several studies have shown also that a higher percent of older persons live in substandard dwellings than does the rest of the population.

In determining the scale of the relocation problem for the elderly, we recommend strongly that comprehensive data be collected on all displacement activity, not only that stemming from urban renewal actions but from anticipated highway construction, code enforcement, and private institutional actions as well. We support the contention that requirements for relocation applicable to urban renewal operations in turn be made to apply equally to all federally aided programs which involve acquisition and clearance of residential property.

As a device for collecting more comprehensive data we call the subcommittee's attention to the community renewal program authorized by the Housing Act of 1959. The CRP, which is essentially designed as a comprehensive coordinated action program to attack and prevent blight on a communitywide scale places heavy emphasis on determining the magnitude of relocation created by proposed renewal and related governmental actions. In this sense it can provide a truer picture of the total impact of Government action as it affects the elderly than any other instrument heretofore available. In addition the CRP can more reliably assess the capacity of the housing market to satisfactorily accommodate displaced elderly families.

As it stands today, however, no specific reference is made to the elderly in the CRP policy documents issued by the Urban Renewal Administration. Perhaps some such reference could be incorporated following the lines of the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly in its August 1962, report which urged URA to recognize the special needs and physical limitations of elderly people by specifically requiring their consideration in relocation plans. It is interesting to note that more than half of the 15 largest cities that rank highest in terms of the percentage of population 65 and over have now embarked on community renewal programs.

Apart from a quantitative description of the problem, communities must have a better understanding of the psychological and emotional effects of relocation on elderly persons as a guide to determining proper policies and standards.

Does involuntary dislocation from a residential area represent a severe grief response comparable to and in many instances more extreme than the grief responses which occur after the loss of a very close person, as suggested by some experts? Or is it possible through sensitive handling of elderly relocatees to find them comfortable housing and environmental surroundings satisfactory enough to compensate for the personal and social difficulties they experience when they are forced to move?

More studies must be undertaken to assess the sociological and mental health implications of relocation for the elderly as have been done by the Rhode Island Division of Aging, the Harvard group in the West End studies, and the Menninger Clinic research team.

Undoubtedly there are relocation programs now operative that pay particular attention to the needs of the elderly. These programs should be identified, analyzed, and highlighted so as to serve as useful models for other communities.

A real need in relocation is for more careful and individual treatment of the displaced elderly families. This necessitates some policy which states clearly that it is in the best interests of the community to pay careful attention to the emotional requirements and financial capacities of the older population so as to facilitate their replacement in the most suitable surroundings—areas where appropriate community facilities are available, transportation accessible, other age groups in evidence, topography suitable, and the potential for variety and diverting activity possible. Where elderly families are found to be unable to pay for adequate quarters in another area thought should be given to increasing their relocation allotments as well as to the use of rent subsidies so that they can compete for better housing in the open market.

In areas with a high percent of elderly residents, Government might consider a policy of minimal clearance action so as to house the elderly in their old neighborhoods as long as possible. This would apply to highway construction as well as urban renewal activity. Residential rehabilitation rather than clearance and reuse may be the desired treatment. Where elderly families cannot afford these rehabilitation costs, consideration might be given to some form of subsidy.

If residential clearance is absolutely essential, displaced elderly families might be given first priority to move back into the renewed area as the first stage projects are completed. Part of the renewal plan might call for public and private specially designed senior citizen housing units, preferably low rise and scattered throughout the renewal area. In this way the elderly could be allowed to remain in their accustomed surroundings while being provided with better designed and serviced facilities.

One expert in summing up current thinking toward the older population says that "it stresses social responsibility to take care of the elderly with the same energy and responsibility as is exhibited in caring for infants and young children." Family belongingness is being replaced by a sense of community belongingness with a strong feeling emerging that positive community actions must be taken to help the older generation. The interest of this subcommittee is a sound reflection of that broader concern. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much. You have been very, very helpful and have "zeroed in" on points of particular interest to this committee.

Mr. FRANTZ. I have perhaps one or two questions. You make the statement that cities are committed to action and change in order to survive. This seems to imply some sort of assumption as to what we want our cities to be like and the role of the city in modern life.

The assumption doesn't come through to me. Would you tell us what lies behind this statement that cities are necessarily committed to change and action right now?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I think, first of all, you find considerable concern for making physical improvements and changes in a city, the goals here being greater efficiency and economy.

The concerns stated by Mrs. Jacobs this afternoon are more human and social in nature, yet they still involve some community action.

I think you find some concern for change because of the growth of our suburban areas and the competition arising among governmental units outside of the central city—this whole tendency toward metropolitan planning and metropolitan organization.

Central cities are concerned with making themselves more vital entities. I am not sure whether the objectives have really been singled out. I think it varies by community.

We see reflections of this desire for change and action in moves to revitalize the central city, moves to bring the leadership element back into the central city, moves to provide better mass transportation facilities, moves to compensate for some of our traffic congestion, and concern for some of the problems of our low income and minority groups who are at a disadvantage in competing for some of the goods and services that city life offers.

Mr. FRANTZ. To take us into the reference you made to the CRP program, is it possible within CRP to do research and planning beyond the quantitative aspects of the problems?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I would think so. I think the Federal policy that has been established for CRP is quite flexible and loose at the present stage.

One particular concern is for a clearer identification of objectives, so that we can set more intelligent policies and program action to achieve these policies. I think many CRP communities are now getting into this phase and they eventually are going to have to ask some very hard questions and perhaps have to make some answers which may not be the kinds of answers they have made in the past.

I think the program has the potential for raising some of these very fundamental questions about what is the role and purpose of a city, especially in the sense that it is tied to renewal, getting into problems of blight, underprivileged groups, and so on.

The program is too new to really evaluate, however, because it is only a couple of years old. Most cities that have entered the program are at a very elementary stage.

We recently sponsored a workshop at Chicago where we invited about 15 representatives from various communities who are operating ongoing community renewal programs and one of the very elemental points that came out of that workshop was a concern for stating clearer objectives to guide actions, not just quantifying problems.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, very much. At this point we will insert in the record the prepared statement of Mr. Kaufman.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Kaufman follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JEROME L. KAUFMAN, PRINCIPAL PLANNER, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS

My name is Jerome Kaufman. I am a principal planner on the staff of the American Society of Planning Officials, a nonprofit professional organization, founded in 1934, whose concern is the fostering of the best techniques and decisions for the planned development of communities and regions. Our organization is supported in large part by over 700 public and private planning agencies who subscribe to our research and technical services. We are therefore in an excellent position to gage the ongoing interests, activities, and concerns of the majority of planning agencies in the United States.

Planning for all age groups is an inviolable principle; in practice, however, city planners have been unduly preoccupied with certain age groups. Like the postwar housing boom, the approach to community development and planning has been child and family centered. Spurred on by the realization that the aged comprise a larger and larger portion of the total population, by the profusion of Federal programs that have been recently adopted to augment the housing supply for older persons, and by the concerted efforts of local welfare councils and committees on aging, city planners have begun in the past few years to more closely investigate the special problems and needs of the elderly population.

They are starting to help find answers to a variety of questions. What qualities of a community make it more livable for older persons? Should a dispersal or concentration of older citizens be encouraged as a matter of city policy? Should zoning and subdivision control regulations be modified to accommodate special housing developments for the elderly? Should local policy encourage the building of special housing units for the elderly, or encourage the increase of their economic capacity to compete for housing in the existing market? What impact will an increasing number of older persons have on the local economy, the transportation system? How should the elderly be treated in urban renewal, both in terms of displacement and the provision of new services?

Two related events are occurring in the field of relocation that are moving Government to act more responsibly in developing and administering relocation



programs. First, the number of families forced to move as a result of several public programs is growing. Perhaps the number annually dislocated by residential renewal activity has leveled out as a result of the shift from clearance to conservation activity; nonetheless, the overall total has risen as new expressways and freeways lace the community and as more residential sites are condemned and cleared for industrial and institutional renewal purposes. Added to this is the tendency for some private investors to purchase scattered residential properties, clear them, and build higher density facilities for a higher income market without the use of public moneys.

Second, there is a growing concern that the relocation notion should be expanded and thought of in larger terms, not just as another phase in the renewal operation but as a program in its own right. Families relocated two or three times from blighted areas, separate relocation operations for renewal and highway development programs, and the recognition that relocation is often more an emotional than a rehousing problem, are forcing a careful appraisal of existing relocation efforts.

All those discommoded by public action are inconvenienced to some extent, with some groups—the aged, large families, and nonwhites—being unduly inconvenienced. Although my remarks are specially directed to the problems of the elderly, reflecting the particular interest of this subcommittee, I would like to point out that the discussion and recommendations offered, in many respects, are applicable as well for other groups—the difference being one of degree and kind.

My 75-year-old grandfather has a penchant for shifting about the city, moving from apartment to apartment, rarely staying in one place for more than a few months. I suspect he would be able to get over the effects of being involuntarily relocated much easier than the vast majority of the older population. He is basically rootless, still quite active physically and mentally, and probably secretly relishes the prospect of moving once again; it gives him something to do. Other elderly persons are equally mobile; forced to move because of clearance, some might pick themselves up easily and move, for example, to a planned retirement community in the South or Far West.

Sufficient studies have been undertaken, however, to indicate that the bulk of the elderly population encounters much greater difficulty when faced with the prospect of forced eviction. Older persons tend to live longer in their present dwelling units than the rest of the population, thus develop a stronger emotional attachment to their homes and neighborhoods. Even when elderly persons have few social contacts, studies show that movement out of a familiar area often means the serious disruption of an established way of life which they want to maintain. It is a known fact that the aged have more difficulty in adapting to new physical surroundings.

In view of the older person's limited financial resources and relative inflexibility of income potential, the cost of moving and renting new quarters—often at a higher price—is also a more serious obstacle. Those elderly persons who own their homes and have established sizable equities, encounter considerable difficulty in obtaining insured mortgages on new quarters because of the financial risk the elderly are assumed to represent. The FHA program to insure mortgages on home and rental housing for persons 65 years and older when friends, relatives, or a corporation make the downpayment for the purchase of the home, and the complementary Fannie Mae program to purchase mortgages on individual homes for people 62 years and older, may mitigate this particular difficulty in the future.

Obviously, these general findings point to the need for a careful, go slow approach in relocating elderly persons. Cities, though, are committed to action and change if they wish to survive as vital entities. This requirement causes disruptions in the conduct of human life—i.e., the necessity to relocate people from their familiar surroundings. The task then becomes infinitely more complex: to minimize individual hardship and maximize the chance for productive and stable life within the broader context of moving ahead as a community. In other words, we must reconcile the larger community goals with the narrower goals of the individual.

As a first step in assessing the impact of involuntary relocation on the elderly, communities should have a reasonably accurate picture of the magnitude of the problems anticipated—how many older persons will be dislocated because of governmental action; what are their general characteristics in terms of household size, income, employment status, and health condition; what is the ability of the housing market to satisfactorily rehouse these persons?

In some communities, the number of older persons to be displaced may be quite high. Over 13 percent of the population of Minneapolis, for example, is 65 years of age and over—the city, by the way, ranks first among the 25 largest U.S. cities in terms of the percent of population 65 and over. According to a recent study by the Minneapolis Planning Commission, close to 60 percent of the city's older residents (about 30,000 people) live in areas subject either to conservation, rehabilitation, or clearance treatment. Thus, large numbers of older persons may be forced to move from their present quarters as a result of renewal activity.

Los Angeles reports that the over-65 age group has for many years represented a large and steadily increasing proportion of the total central city area, about 20 percent now as compared with 10 percent for the city as a whole. The pattern of most of the elderly citizens being concentrated in older parts of the city, those areas most subject to blight treatment, is fairly common in many communities. Several studies have shown also that a higher percent of older persons live in substandard dwellings than does the rest of the population (Milwaukee Housing Authority, 1958; HHFA, 1960).

In determining the scale of the relocation problem for elderly persons, we recommend strongly that comprehensive data be collected on all displacement activity, not only that stemming from urban renewal actions, but from anticipated highway construction, code enforcement, and private institutional actions as well. We support the contention that requirements for relocation applicable to urban renewal operations, in turn, be made to apply equally to all federally aided programs which involve acquisition and clearance of residential property.

As a device for collecting comprehensive data, we call the subcommittee's attention to the community renewal program, authorized by the Federal Housing Act of 1959. The CRP, which is essentially designed as a comprehensive, coordinated action-program to attack and prevent blight on a communitywide scale, places heavy emphasis on determining the magnitude of relocation created by proposed renewal and related governmental actions. In this sense, it can provide a truer picture of the total impact of Government action as it affects the elderly than any other instrument heretofore available. In addition, the CRP can more reliably assess the capacity of the housing market to satisfactorily accommodate displaced elderly families.

As it stands today, however, no specific reference is made to the elderly in CRP policy documents issued by the Urban Renewal Administration. Perhaps some such reference could be incorporated, following the lines of the recommendation of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly in its August 1962 report, which urged URA to recognize the special needs and physical limitations of elderly people by specifically requiring their consideration in relocation plans. It is interesting to note that more than half of the 15 largest cities that rank highest in terms of percent of population 65 and over have already embarked on community renewal programs.

Apart from a quantitative description of the problem, communities must have a better understanding of the psychological and emotional effects of relocation on elderly persons as a guide to determining proper policies and standards. Does involuntary dislocation from a residential area represent a severe grief response comparable to and in many instances more extreme than the grief responses which occur after the loss of a very close person, as suggested by some experts? Or is it possible, through sensitive handling of elderly relocatees, to find them comfortable housing and environmental surroundings, satisfactory enough to compensate for the personal and social difficulties they experience when they are forced to move? More studies must be undertaken to assess the sociological and mental health implications of relocations for the elderly as have been done by the Rhode Island Division of Aging (1960), the Harvard group in the West End studies, and the Menninger Clinic research team.

Relocation often creates a two-sided problem: first, a hardship on the displaced family, and second, an adverse reaction by residents in the receiving area toward their new neighbors. Elderly relocated persons, though, probably pose the least threat to residents of the receiving areas. In general, they are passive, possess few of the unsavory traits associated with problem families—crime, delinquency, illegitimacy—and impose no great burden on community facilities like schools, parks, and streets. Because of these characteristics, the range of locational choice older persons have is probably much greater than that possessed by most other families displaced by governmental action.

Undoubtedly, there are relocation programs now operative that pay particular attention to the needs of the elderly. These programs must be identified, analyzed, and highlighted so as to serve as useful models for other communities.

A real need in relocation is for more careful and individual treatment of displaced elderly families. This necessitates some policy which states clearly that it is in the best interest of the community to pay careful attention to the emotional requirements and financial capacities of the older population so as to facilitate their replacement in the most suitable environment—areas where appropriate community facilities are available, transportation accessible, other age groups in evidence, topography suitable, and the potential for variety and diverting activity possible. Where elderly families are found to be unable to pay for adequate quarters in other areas, thought should be given to increasing their relocation payments allotments as well as to the use of rent subsidies so that they can compete for better housing in the open market.

In areas with a high percent of elderly residents, Government might consider adopting a policy of minimal clearance action so as to house the elderly in their old neighborhoods as long as possible. Residential rehabilitation, rather than clearance and reuse, may be the desired treatment. Where elderly families cannot afford rehabilitation costs, consideration might be given to some form of subsidy.

If residential clearance is absolutely essential, displaced families might be given top priority to move back into the renewed area as the first stage projects are completed. Part of the renewal plan might call for public and private specially designed senior citizen housing units, preferably low-rise and scattered throughout the renewal area. In this way, the elderly could be allowed to remain in their accustomed surroundings while in addition being provided with better designed and serviced facilities.

One expert, in summing up current thinking toward the older population, says that it "stresses societal responsibility to take care of the elderly with the same energy and responsibility as is exhibited in caring for infants and young children." (Robert T. Monroe in "Housing the Aging," University of Michigan Press, 1954.) Family belongingness is being replaced by a sense of community belongingness, with a strong feeling emerging that positive community actions must be taken to help the older generation. The interest of this subcommittee is a sound reflection of that broader concern.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Dutton. We are pleased to have now Mr. Dutton and his colleague, Mr. Robert Gladstone.

**STATEMENT OF W. C. DUTTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS; ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT GLADSTONE, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY COMMITTEE**

Senator WILLIAMS. After I left the Los Angeles Conference of the American Institute of Planners, I went to see an amazing development, a city of considerable size that was built up in the desert and all with private funds—Las Vegas. You may proceed.

Mr. DUTTON. Sir, I will abbreviate my prepared remarks and I think Mr. Gladstone might have a comment or two to offer if you have time and we would be glad to answer any questions.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is fine.

Mr. DUTTON. We are pleased to be with you today. We understand you intend to conduct further studies of problems involved in the relocation of elderly persons, resulting from various public improvement programs such as your urban renewal, highway building, code enforcement, possibly rapid transit some day and so forth.

Although we have not been able to study this particular problem in detail, we would like to suggest a few ideas and thoughts for further study by your subcommittee.

If we can be of further help during your studies and future hearings, we would be glad to try, particularly in making available the experience of our 3,000 members working as professional planning officials and consultants in communities throughout the country.

## I. URBAN IMPROVEMENT AND RELOCATION

Initially, we would like to observe that the problems faced in relocating people satisfactorily are caused primarily by forces that we consider to be essentially good in our society. It is to be expected, and hoped, that even larger numbers of people will be relocated in the future, albeit by better and more understanding approaches as we learn from our experience.

The following points suggest the context within which relocation programs must be developed for the future:

(1) Rapid changes in urban areas will continue. These will be marked particularly by continued in-migration of large numbers of people; changing functions of urban centers, particularly in large metropolitan areas, resulting in changing uses of land, transportation systems and requirements, and patterns of community health and welfare needs and services; and also in attempts to achieve higher goals and standards of living for all of our citizens, including those whose lives have been lengthened by the contributions of modern medicine.

(2) There will continue to be a high coincidence of land areas undergoing physical change and the location of elderly persons' households. This can be explained, partially at least, by the presence of elderly persons who are long-time residents of the older parts of our cities, the parts most functionally obsolete and most appropriate for other usages; the inability of many aged persons to participate in the most successful Federal housing programs of FHA and VA, let alone conventional housing programs (it is a tribute to our rapidly advancing economy that so many other families have been able to relocate on their own initiative), and the desire of many to remain in familiar surroundings for all of their lives.

(3) There will be strengthened efforts to change and improve our urban centers and, progressively more so in the future, these efforts will be coordinated more effectively within total metropolitan programs.

The need of expanded and more fruitful programs for guiding change into desired development has been widely recognized and is based on such fundamentals as the need for improved economic efficiency to permit higher standards of living, as well as improve our competitive position in the world economy, the desire for social improvements in such areas as health and welfare services, esthetics of surroundings, recreation, etc., and a better distribution of housing opportunities throughout metropolitan areas, properly coordinated with transportation services, open space, etc.

We are aware that the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly has just submitted a report of its recent study and that legislation has been introduced in the Congress which relates closely to this subject.

The validity of studying problems that may be peculiar to various segments of the population also is accepted, even though it is possible that the ultimate results desired require general rather than particular solutions and programs.

## II. POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO AID LOCAL AREA APPROACHES

It is suggested that the ultimate success of relocation programs will depend on the several local governments but that they, in turn, will need considerable aid from the National Government in the form of technical advice and leadership, as well as financial aids. Other national contributions, especially in the areas of research and training of competent personnel, are critically needed.

Some possible improvements and encouraging experiments and demonstrations now underway can be grouped into two categories—planning and programs.

### (1) PLANNING

The need for more comprehensive studies and programs to relate social and economic aspects of urban life to physical planning is recognized increasingly. A partial inventory of current activities or recent studies includes programs in the cities of Baltimore, Boston, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Newark, Oakland, and Pittsburgh. Long range projections of physical renewal needs, such as carried out in Detroit and Philadelphia, provide the basis for discovering related social and economic ramifications. The materials of workshops of the National Social Welfare Assembly and meetings of the Joint Committee on Housing attempt to describe the problems and study ways to solve them. The increased Federal housing agency concern with CRP (community renewal program), economic base studies, and metropolitan housing market analysis techniques provides desirable support for more adequate and broader community approaches and programs.

A few suggestions for further improvements occur to us as deserving of investigation:

(a) The establishment of an aid program, similar to the 701 program in the Housing Act of 1954, to encourage comprehensive and long-range planning in the health and welfare services in our metropolitan areas, presumably under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with major attention to problems of the elderly being included.

(b) The encouragement, by appropriate bodies, of vastly expanded programs of interdisciplinary studies into and seminars for local officials and entrepreneurs and about the problems of relocation.

(c) The identification of the extent to which problems of the elderly in relocation are special, as well as the extent and number of the elderly involved in the rebuilding of blighted areas, conservation and rehabilitation programs, clearance of land for other public improvement programs, and likely to be affected by purely private enterprise rebuilding activities.

(d) The provision of sufficient national and local data and analyses to allow creative thinking toward new solutions. This should include more frequent census data for local areas, such as has been proposed for each mid-decade. Also needed is a breakdown into component parts of the present national housing policy so as to State goals and standards for different areas of need. These can be used to judge

against such questions as: Should efforts to solve problems of the elderly in housing be by separate programs? What are the needs in a cycle of an elderly household in different stages? What are the variations involved in mobility desired, changing physical capacities, income trends? Can elderly housing programs be reintegrated with other federally aided programs?

(e) The strengthening of data requirements concerning relocation effects of all proposed federally aided programs, totaled on a community basis of all projects, as an element of project review.

(f) The continuation and strengthening of the system of intergovernmental relations and cooperation that has been developed to deal with urban problems, including but not limited to:

(1) The CRP, to provide long-term programing for urban renewal, highway, and other Federal aid projects.

(2) Support of metropolitan planning during these critical years of attempting to coordinate local programs of growth.

(3) Financial aids to critical programs which cannot be based on local tax structures alone, due to inadequate municipal tax systems, but are needed to make our cities better places for people of all ages and incomes.

(4) Sponsoring of demonstration programs to seek new approaches, such as the four city metropolitan data center study program, headquartered in Tulsa, Okla.

## (2) PROGRAMS

In one sense, all programs requiring that people be relocated should meet the same standard, for all people, that is, to help them with their needs and the solving of their social and economic problems. Nevertheless, it must be realized that the needs of some groups such as elderly, minority, low-income, and various components having more than one of these characteristics may exceed the needs of other groups. A few suggestions for investigation are as follows:

(a) The establishment of central relocation bureaus in all cities appears as a growing necessity to supply desirable data for all Federal programs, to bring experienced and competent aid to the several programs operating in most large cities, and to work toward the objective of securing relocation cooperation on a multijurisdictional, metropolitan basis.

(b) The possibility of devising a combination program which would allow the bringing together in one area of all of the housing programs that have been devised to meet the problem of low or inadequate income families, together with other housing programs involving some Federal participation, like the FHA and FNMA. Such a program might lead to more highly developed suburban centers, or new towns, and permit more effective private builder participation in meeting the various needs in our housing market.

Imaginative thinking and positive policies will be required to permit achievement of sound planning objectives such as—

creation of a better balanced supply of subsidized housing in both central and outlying areas \* \* \* the need for correcting the existing serious maladjustments in metropolitan housing supply and programing is so severe as to deserve continuous efforts to find solutions.

(1961 AIP Government Relations Conference.)

(c) The improved coordination of and experimentation with Federal housing aid programs with urban renewal, rapid transit, and open-space programs to rebuild and create desirable central area neighborhoods suitable for wide cross sections of our population.

(d) The desirability of extending relocation requirements contained in the urban renewal program to other programs involving Federal aid.

(e) The highlighting of planning and research efforts to assist in the improved functioning of private housing efforts and cooperative actions of governmental jurisdictions within metropolitan areas; particularly with reference to the interests of this subcommittee in knowing to what extent our elderly people have housing problems that are special and what can be expected of the existing programs that have already been desired to encourage new housing for the elderly.

May I ask Mr. Gladstone to supplement?

Senator WILLIAMS. Could you help us on page 7 of your statement about the correcting of the serious maladjustment?

Mr. DUTTON. Yes, sir. Basically, the fact is that we are dealing with a housing market that is metropolitan in scope and does not recognize political jurisdictions, whereas many of the housing programs that we are operating with public support do tend to work within specific political jurisdictions. We have problems of the central city trying to renew itself, to establish a balance of housing supply suitable to a metropolitan area but the suburban towns or cities not being concerned with these problems, not yet participating in programs that would help provide for relocation of minority groups, low-income groups, and so forth.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Gladstone, will you come forward?

Mr. GLADSTONE. I would like to respond only a little bit more specifically than I think our statement does up to the present time to the implications of Mrs. Jacobs' remarks earlier this afternoon.

We have embarked on a series of programs which are rather grand in their scope and objective in terms of urban renewal, freeway construction, and other programs and devices in our cities. Mrs. Jacobs' remarks, at least as I heard them, are highly critical of these programs in terms of their consequences. While I can appreciate Mrs. Jacobs' sensitivity to some of these consequences I think the overall sense of her remarks tends to reject the programs in terms of some of the consequences that they have generated. Speaking for the National Housing Policy Committee of the American Institute of Planners, of which I am chairman, I think we have to reject that overall sense of her remarks. It is a little bit like, it seems to me, the proposition of throwing the baby out with the bath water when the water gets dirty. I think what clearly is indicated, as an alternative, is to respond to the particular problems she points to. That is, first we have a need for better and more extensive relocation programs and procedures, and to hit at other problems and points that arise out of highway programs and urban renewal programs. This is particularly an issue with respect to elderly groups and housing for the elderly. Secondly, we need to improve the quality and availability, on an across the board sense, of housing and again particularly for elderly

groups. Fundamental to each of these two steps, needed to perfect the approaches to the consequences of some of the programs we have been discussing here, is the need for better data. Better data to identify and quantify and place some dimension on the scale and character of the kind of problems created. In turn, better data is in order to sharpen our knowledge of the types of housing that we might make available in responding to the relocation needs.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I have one question, Senator, if I may. Mr. Dutton, in your statement you seem to agree with other witnesses we have heard this morning that there should be some sort of central relocating agency. I wish you would comment on this. There may be extensive relocation involved because of private building. I have heard people discuss this—not in the hearing—that neighborhoods become attractive for office buildings or huge high rise apartments and privately they are bought out; and there may be good existing structures but they are replaced by other structures that are in demand. You feel that this displacement should be taken on by the central relocating body that would be in existence, one that is a public body. Do I understand your statement correctly in that respect?

Mr. DUTTON. I was not suggesting that there be a public function requiring or forcing private developers or redevelopers to go through a public agency for relocation of their occupants of a building that might be converted or torn down. I don't say this is not a possibility that should not be considered in the future. I was trying to suggest more that if we did not have a public urban renewal program we would still be getting a great deal of conversion of existing structures and demolitions of existing structures as private investment sought to provide the facilities and programs that they are now doing under urban renewal. You find this going on in the city of Washington in certain areas as well as other very active large cities of the country. I really was suggesting there is an element here of relocation demand that is built up by private forces without any public activity occurring.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Do you think the government, either Federal, State, or local, has some responsibility in this area? That is the question I am asking.

Mr. DUTTON. I suppose the public responsibility will continue to be dealing with whatever the excess is. Whether private actions are contributing to the total excess of demand over the availability of space available for relocation or in some cases I could see that private action might be so great that they would be causing a relocation problem in that community without there being any public improvement programs.

Mr. GLADSTONE. I don't believe that the local government or any central relocation agency should have direct responsibility but I think a bonus byproduct of central relocation effort, which I would certainly advocate, would be the availability of information on housing inventory resources for any private stimulated relocation need. More specifically, the scale of relocation caused by private actions is so small, in relation to the scale of relocation because of public action, that they pall by comparison. In some cities in the past decade, 1950 to 1960, as much as 8 percent and in a few instances where the total size of the city was small, a slightly larger percentage of the total inventory was demolished by various public actions. The first pro-



gram in number of demolitions is highway, No. 2 urban renewal, and No. 3 housing code enforcement. In one city with which I am familiar, 8 percent of the city was demolished by various actions, less than 1 percent was demolished by private action. I mean significantly less than 1 percent. I don't think the scale of the problem is anywhere near as serious. For that reason, it simply is not as important as the kind of problem that relates to the public programs we are talking about. Again, I want to stress the fact that a byproduct of the central relocation agency and the kind of data programs that have been mentioned here before and in the previous committee report on housing for the elderly would yield information which would help solve the problem.

Senator WILLIAMS. I haven't anything further. Thank you very much again to AIP and its most worthy spokesmen, Mr. Dutton and Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. DUTTON. Thank you, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. The last shall not be least around here. Mrs. Johnson, your turn has come. You have been very patient, and we certainly are looking forward to your statement as spokesman for the National Urban League.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. CERNORIA D. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR OF THE WASHINGTON BUREAU OF THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, REPRESENTING WHITNEY R. YOUNG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE**

Mrs. JOHNSON. Thank you, sir. I am Cernoria D. Johnson, and I serve as the Washington representative for the National Urban League.

The National Urban League, with its central office in New York City, is a network of affiliated voluntary social service agencies operating in 63 major industrial cities of the Nation, serving more than 60 percent of the total urban Negro population. These league affiliates are manned by 500 professionally trained social workers, who possess a variety of experience in community service.

Enhancing and supplementing the work of the employed staff are some 6,000 community leaders, Negro and white, who, without compensation, bring to the work of the league a virtually limitless reservoir of strengths, skills, and talent. This farflung interracial force of volunteers is dedicated to the Urban League goal of equal opportunity.

The Urban League's presentation must take into consideration that our American citizens—60 years of age and older—are not confronting the problem of relocation alone. There is a continuity to life. Therefore, to adequately discuss this social phenomenon, it is necessary that careful study be given to the social conditions from which today's problems in the relocation of the elderly emerge.

I wish to speak regarding the conditions that confront the American Negro, particularly the elderly who are vitally affected by urban relocation. As a social work agency, we seek to improve the living and working conditions of these people. They come to the age of 60 years and over with other encumbrances not suffered by the majority group members of society. During their most productive years,

18 to 65, they have encountered significant employment differentials which traditionally denied them free movement in the labor market, regardless of their marketable skills.

The lack of full employment opportunity means that in 1939 non-white male workers earned about 41 percent as much as whites. A recent Urban League bulletin, "Economic and Social Status of the Negro in the United States," using preliminary estimates of the Bureau of the Census for 1960 states that—

The average (median) income of the Negro family today—\$3,233—was little better than half of the white family median of \$5,835—approximately the same ratio as has prevailed throughout most of the last 13 years. One-half of the nonwhite families in the United States, therefore, had \$62 a week or less in money income, compared with \$112 a week for white families.

In addition to the limitation of inadequate income with which to prepare for the future, the social security programs mean lower benefits for the elderly Negro. This program, designed to help the economically disadvantaged, excluded in the early years, farm labor, domestic service, and certain other types of work in which the non-white worker engaged. Even following the 1950, 1954, and 1956 amendments that removed most of the restrictions from coverage, the nonwhite worker still receives lower benefits than the white worker's family since payments are wage related.

Summarizing this dimension of the problem of relocation of the elderly, the Urban League emphasizes that after two decades of improved economic status, the Negro—both elderly and the employable worker—is a victim of these conditions:

- (1) Negroes are more likely to work in unskilled or semiskilled jobs.
- (2) When at work, Negroes are employed fewer hours per week.
- (3) Negro unemployment rates are twice as high as those of whites.
- (4) Negro men earn 60 percent as much as white men, while Negro women earn a little more than half as much as white women.
- (5) Despite higher unemployment rates, nonwhites have less protection under the unemployment insurance programs, and because so often they are in the lower paid occupations those that are protected receive smaller benefits than unemployed whites.

The National Urban League realizes that the lack of adequate housing constitutes one of America's greatest social lags. But more crucial is the displacement, deprivation, and denial that grows out of another almost insurmountable difficulty; that is, exclusion from the housing market because of race, creed, or color. In the words of Dr. Robert C. Weaver—

\* \* \* equal opportunity in shelter, as equal opportunity in employment, requires two basic considerations. First, an adequate supply of housing or jobs to meet the needs of the total population, and, secondly, an equal access to that supply on the part of all segments of the population.

Even without data which will document the existence of many social ills, it is apparent that in most of the major metropolitan areas of the country, undergoing urban renewal, urban redevelopment, and highway improvement programs, the Negro inhabits to a greater percent the areas chosen for improvement. A recent study in Connecticut is indicative of the fact that in the old decaying sections of central city are also found the greatest proportion of the aging popula-

tion \* \* \*. Succinctly expressed in the words of a witness during the St. Louis hearings, December 8, 1961 :

The older \* \* \* (the resident) the better his chance of finding himself in an older residential area of the city, keeping company with a residence which like himself, is getting ripe with years.

Removal of these citizens from their familiar surroundings creates not only an undesirable emotional and psychological condition, but uproots them if they are homeowners, from a home in which they have often invested their life's earnings—and their hopes for a haven in the declining years. Into the larger community when and where relocation is attempted, they meet many of the following problems, namely:

(1) The absence of open occupancy in housing, both public and private, for the nonwhite.

(2) The inability to finance a new home in view of the present inflated cost of housing, especially at this stage of life.

(3) Financial inability to pay inflated rental cost for housing which is largely substandard.

(4) The unavailability of desirable and adequate institutional facilities for those who prefer it. (Where they do exist the cost is prohibitive for old-age pensioners, and those with limited incomes.)

(5) Finally, where some financial return can be expected from sale of the "old home place" the present tax structure again penalizes the disadvantaged. If forced to sell, and purchase of another house is not within the year, a capital gain tax may be deducted.

In view of this belief and sketchy socioeconomic picture of the plight of the Negro elderly, certain conclusions are reached by the National Urban League. Based upon them, we offer some suggested proposals for easing the transition that comes with being "uprooted from a known and chartered way of life."

#### IN CONCLUSION

The housing needs of the Negro elderly—due to economic and social pressures enumerated—are more crucial than those of the majority population. Unless decisive action is taken in the immediate future conditions will become more crucial.

Decent and adequate public and private housing available to non-whites is almost nonexistent in most of the metropolitan areas of the United States. Where this commodity is available, even in a limited quantity, the inflated prices charged the Negro often leaves the elderly unable to purchase or rent. Moreover, the price the elderly Negro receives for his home is not enough to cover the cost of another—and mortgagors are not disposed to make loans to this age group.

Recognizing that the city must face realistically their problems of physical blight and declining neighborhoods, the human element in this equation must be given equal consideration. We know many homeowners who fear the onslaught of urban renewal and urban redevelopment. They feel that the mere offer of low rental public housing—which often is not available—is a poor substitute for the human satisfactions and deep personal attachments destroyed by the loss of (even) a dilapidated home.

## SUGGESTED PROPOSALS

The National Urban League suggests that in searching for a fair and humane approach to the tragic problems of human displacement, deprivation and denial—in the face of necessary changes, and improvement that must be made in urban life—that action be taken as follows:

(1) That more research be conducted—under private and public auspices—to determine the extent of the housing needs of the elderly; what they conceive their needs to be; and how those needs can best be met. As stated in a report of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly to the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, under date of August 31, 1962:

Research should be of two kinds—general studies aimed at learning more about the effects of various housing arrangements on older persons and evaluating the varied projects which have been undertaken; and community-by-community studies of the shortcomings of housing for the elderly and the particular needs and desires for improved shelter expressed by the elderly themselves in each locality.

(2) The elderly population of the Nation is growing, and likewise the Negro counterpart since its life expectancy and longevity rate is advancing, too. This creates a situation which calls for an immediate expansion of Federal assistance. Existing programs under FHA insurance, loans, and other special programs for the aging presently constitute only a meager beginning.

(3) Additional Federal Government aid through its various programs of subsidy and assistance—if and when made available—must become a resource wisely utilized by community leadership. Local city planners cooperating with social welfare leaders, should place no restriction on participation, of those who need, and those who plan. Every community planning body in America should include representation from those it seeks to serve.

(4) More specifically, the Urban League endorses these recommendations included in the committee report.

(a) Amend provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 relative to local noncash grants in aid to permit local public agencies to make sites available for development by cooperative and non-profit sponsors of housing for the elderly and to credit the value of such sites to the project as a local noncash grant.

(b) Authorize the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages for the rehabilitation of the residence of an elderly homeowner on terms which do not require full amortization of the loan. Such mortgages could require payment of interest only or interest plus a part of the principal with the balance becoming due upon the sale, devolution, or other transfer of the property.

(c) Authorize rent subsidies for limited periods to enable persons displaced by urban renewal or other Federal programs to obtain decent housing, the subsidies to be included as part of the project cost.

Our experience has impressed upon us the need for Congress to meet the problem of housing for the elderly unflinchingly. If its investigations show that any sector of the housing market is or may become inadequate for easily foreseeable needs, then Congress should come forth quickly with a program of sufficient size to make a massive and effective attack on the problem of housing for the elderly. Moreover, in confronting this situation there is a need for an expanded and more comprehensive relocation program built into whatever housing plan we might present for the aging. Until an adequate relocation program is established in every city, until planning for the needs of citizens provide for full participation of the people who not only need to be served but those who can serve and offer creative leadership, until these and other features are built into the urban renewal, urban redevelopment, and highway programs, and thus guarantee to eliminate and/or soften the tragic uprooting of the elderly and others, we will never get down to the heart of the housing problem in America.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned at 4 p.m., to reconvene tomorrow, Tuesday, October 23, 1962, at 10 a.m.)

## RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

---

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1962

U.S. SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE  
ELDERLY OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, in room 4230, Senate Office Building, Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senator Williams.

Committee staff members present: William G. Reidy, staff director; Frank C. Frantz, professional staff member; Jack Moskowitz, counsel; and John Guy Miller, minority counsel.

Senator WILLIAMS. To start our hearings, I would like to make just a short statement to open this day's discussion.

The initial hearing of the subcommittee has clearly indicated that expanding urban renewal, highways, and other Federal-State programs are remaking the shape and form of our cities. The onslaught of the bulldozers and wrecking crews are not only dislocating great numbers of people, but often are forcing them to leave existing neighborhoods and living patterns in which they have deep roots and attachments.

The first hearing indicated that the older citizen, who is more numerous in urban areas, is least able to cope with this disruption in his life. He is not only more economically deprived than the younger population, but less able both mentally and physically to make the change.

He is more fixed in his ways. His reliance and familiarity with the comforts of his old neighborhood make a forced move a difficult and trying experience. The elderly, too, have special housing needs which cannot be met with the present supply of housing available for relocation.

There is no question that the displacement of people, through changes in our cities, is creating actual suffering among many of our elderly citizens. Since federally sponsored programs are giving much impetus to these changes; it is an obligation and responsibility of Congress to inquire into the nature of these problems and to do something effective to cure them. Congress has recognized this responsibility as evidenced by existing provisions for relocation in the urban renewal program. But something more than this may be needed for our older people.

The District of Columbia, a highly urbanized, complex city with planned massive urban renewal and highway programs, is a mirror of what is going on in every major city in the country.

As the Nation's Capital, it has a duty to be an example to the Nation and to the world of effective planning with true concern for the interests of its citizenry. District officials and responsible citizens are cognizant of this duty and have been laboring tirelessly to find ways under existing legislation to meet these problems effectively.

Any human suffering or failings that are caused by federally sponsored urban renewal or highway programs in the District will be seized upon by those who oppose programs to improve deteriorating living conditions of our cities.

Therefore, it should be the first order of business of the subcommittee to inquire into the nature of the problems in the District of Columbia. Thus, the subcommittee has set aside today to hear from witnesses familiar with the workings of the programs causing dislocation of our older citizens in the District and the needs of these citizens themselves.

Our first witness, I am glad to say, to be with us, and help us in our deliberations, is Brig. Gen. F. J. Clarke, Engineer Commissioner of the District.

#### **STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. F. J. CLARKE, ENGINEER COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

General CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, I am Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia. I appear before your subcommittee today on behalf of the Board of Commissioners.

You have asked to hear from District officials and agencies regarding "the practical realities of carrying out public programs with due concern for the interest of the elderly residents affected," public programs, in this instance, being specifically those which involve condemnation and clearance of urban land.

The subject of this hearing is of great interest to the Commissioners because it is a well-known fact that the population of the District has been "aging." Of a total population of approximately 764,000, some 103,000 of our fellow citizens, or roughly 13 percent, were 60 years of age or over at the time of the 1960 census. 69,000, or 9 percent, were 65 years or older.

As the expected life span increases and as more of our younger families leave the central city, the percentage of aged in relation to the rest of the population is likely to increase. We must, therefore, be particularly concerned about the impact of all of our public works programs on the aged segment of our citizenry.

A projection of family displacement by Government action for the 5 fiscal years, 1963-67, inclusive, indicates that some 11,000 families will be affected. Even if we assume that the percentage of the elderly to be displaced will be no larger than their relation to the rest of the population, there is sufficient reason for concern since the moves will be required when most of these people are least able to fend for themselves.

The Commissioners and the Board of the National Capital Housing Authority have been anticipating these developments. Already under construction are some 480 public housing units designed primarily for elderly persons. Increasingly, programs of the Housing Au-

thority are being devised for the aged, in conjunction with departments of the District government, to take care of such urgent basic needs as health, welfare, and recreation.

The staff of our two relocation services, the one in the Redevelopment Land Agency and the other in the Department of Public Welfare, have been helping the displaced elderly to find new homes and to resolve their personal problems.

Aside from the public housing units which are being built specifically for the aged, it is our hope that the liberalized provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 will generate new interest in providing private housing and nursing homes for the elderly. The Commissioners and the citizen Urban Renewal Council have assumed the lead in getting private organizations interested in the production of moderate rental housing for all displaced families, including the elderly. Unfortunately, finding vacant land sites in the District at prices that will make such projects economically feasible is a real problem.

Within the past few months the Commissioners have had legislation prepared to authorize establishment of a central relocation service for all families displaced by governmental action, as well as to authorize relocation payments for moving and other necessary expenses to such families. This proposed legislation is now with the Bureau of the Budget. Once cleared, the bill will be sent up to the Congress for its consideration and approval. This central service, we believe, will provide us with much needed information about our displaced families generally, and the aged particularly, including their problems and desires in housing. It should certainly result in the utmost of attention to their needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am accompanied by Nathan Volkman, of our Urban Renewal Office, and Miss Doris Wilkins, of our Landlord-Tenant Service, who works particularly in the fields of assistance and relocation. This is all categories, including the aged, and should you have any questions, either they or I will be delighted to answer them, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. They are working in what?

General CLARKE. Mr. Volkman is in our Urban Renewal Office, concerned with the problems of planning, all aspects of planning, and urban renewal.

Miss Wilkins is directly engaged in the problems of assisting people in their relocation problems.

Senator WILLIAMS. Maybe it would be wise if they came up and joined you. You do have staff for two relocation services?

General CLARKE. Sir, one relocation service is under the Redevelopment Land Agency, which is a Federal agency in the city. The other is in our Department of Public Welfare, the landlord-tenant service, which is concerned primarily with relocation problems other than those of urban renewal.

Senator WILLIAMS. In the Federal program, is this the agency that programs urban renewal in the District?

General CLARKE. The actual operating agency in the urban renewal field, and as a part of their work they have the relocation of the people in the urban renewal project areas. We do have the two separate staffs.



We have introduced legislation—we have it in the Bureau of the Budget, as I said, sir—which would allow us to have one central relocation service.

Senator WILLIAMS. I wonder if you could tell us a little about one of the major urban renewal areas of the country. I think there are 500 acres in Southwest considered one of the Nation's most significant areas of renewal in the program. Am I right?

General CLARKE. That is correct, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. About 500 acres.

General CLARKE. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. This was the total taking?

General CLARKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. How many families lived in this area prior to the renewal program?

**STATEMENTS OF NATHAN VOLKMAN, URBAN RENEWAL OFFICE;  
AND DORIS WILKINS, LANDLORD-TENANT SERVICE, DEPARTMENT  
OF PUBLIC WELFARE**

Mr. VOLKMAN. Approximately 6,000 families.

Senator WILLIAMS. 6,000 families. What are the average family sizes these days—three?

Mr. VOLKMAN. 3.2.

Senator WILLIAMS. 18,000 people. Did they all lose their homes under the program?

Mr. VOLKMAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. This was probably the most gigantic problem of relocation that any area could imagine.

Mr. VOLKMAN. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. As it developed, I would imagine that few, if any, returned to that area to the housing that replaced the old housing.

Mr. VOLKMAN. That is right. I think that is correct, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is one of the problems, isn't it, under renewal—to get an economic return, it has to be middle- to high-rent housing?

Mr. VOLKMAN. Well, that was the situation, as I understand, in Southwest. There are plans for other projects Northwest, one, Adams-Morgan, where I understand—we have not seen finished plans; these are still in the works—but we understand it is hoped to be able to absorb a good many of the present residents in the rehousing that takes place in those areas.

General CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might supplement Mr. Volkman's remarks in that the Commissioners and the National Capital Planning Commission, who are jointly charged with planning of new urban renewal areas, are well agreed on a policy that in future renewal areas, there has to be provision for low-cost housing—the privately financed—and there has to be provision for public housing sites in many of these areas. This requires, for low-cost housing, privately financed, a considerable writedown in the value of the land which the Federal Government and the District government will have to absorb.

Our experience recently in attempting to interest pension funds in investing in low-cost, privately financed housing in the city under the provisions of section 221 has indicated that we cannot find land in the city—or cannot find much land—at a sufficiently low cost to permit construction of low-cost housing.

Senator WILLIAMS. When you say “low-cost housing,” you are referring to low-rent housing?

General CLARKE. I am sorry, sir. This is correct. Speaking in the range of rental of \$65 to perhaps \$95 a month.

Senator WILLIAMS. This will have to be stimulated. The incentive to the private developer will have to come through a break, so to speak, on what he pays for the land.

General CLARKE. This is what our present indication is; yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Has this been done?

General CLARKE. We have some low-cost housing, low-rental housing under construction or under plan in the city at the present time, sir, on sites that have a relatively low cost. But we are rapidly running out of those sites throughout the city.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that in negotiation with private developers?

General CLARKE. Yes, sir. I am speaking of private developers.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is this realistic? Do you think that this is a practical approach that can work out?

General CLARKE. Certainly in our urban renewal areas it can, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. There you can put the squeeze on them in a way.

General CLARKE. We can take land which costs \$3 or \$4 a square foot and perhaps bring it down to \$1.50 a square foot, which then puts it in a range which appears to be economically sound to put in low-rental housing.

Senator WILLIAMS. Under existing law, can that be done under the renewal program?

Mr. VOLKMAN. I am not sure. It is our understanding that the Redevelopment Land Agency is going to appear today, and we didn't go into the economics.

General CLARKE. My understanding is that we can write down the value of the land by two-thirds of acquisition cost, but you can't write it down completely.

Senator WILLIAMS. This is something that strikes me as a proposal that has at least superficially a great deal of merit.

General CLARKE. This is correct, sir. There are other problems that urban renewal can solve which are most difficult for private enterprise to solve. This is the matter of assembly of land into packages that make it economically sound to go into low-rental housing.

It is most difficult for private enterprise to assemble land, particularly if the titles to the land are a little clouded. They cannot get a title guarantee on it. The urban renewal process, condemnation and later sale to private enterprise, permits the assembly of land that otherwise just could not be accomplished in the city.

Senator WILLIAMS. How did the relocation of the 6,000 families in the Southwest work out? First of all, who was in charge?

General CLARKE. That was under the Redevelopment Land Agency, sir, and not a direct District of Columbia function. There will be, I am sure, later testimony on that from Mr. Doyle, of RLA. My re-

action is that it worked out fairly well. The statistics indicate that the great majority of the people have been relocated in decent, safe, and sanitary housing, although there are still some families, mainly large families, requiring four or more bedrooms, where they have not yet been able to find adequate housing for these people.

Mr. VOLKMAN. That is not in the Southwest. That is in Northeast. I don't think there is anyone in the Southwest remaining to be relocated at this time, and the program of relocation, as I remember, was applauded nationally by the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration. It has been cited as one of the best examples of relocation in the United States.

Senator WILLIAMS. There is another kind of relocation going on in Southeast in this restoration period—older homes are being brought back to their original appearance. Do you folks know anything about the problems there and who might be helping those who are dislocated, or relocated by private developers, purchasing the old home, remodeling and all of that?

Miss WILKINS. Sir, I am Doris Wilkins, and for some 20 years I have been the landlord-tenant consultant at the municipal court. I am a part of the staff of the District Department of Public Welfare. In my work as the landlord-tenant consultant, I have concerned myself with the social problems of those who are brought before the landlord-tenant court, either in questions of nonpayment of rent, and, therefore the threatened eviction, or in cases where a landlord, such as you mentioned in your question, seeks to repossess property for rehabilitation or remodeling or whatever other reason, so that for all of these years the District has been concerned with those who are involuntarily displaced.

To concentrate at first on the older residents, your sympathetic statement at the beginning is so true. The older people are indeed most difficult to relocate for the reason that their minds and hearts are so tied to the familiar surroundings that to get them in the state of mind where they are interested in trying to find some other housing presents a major problem. We tried to work with these people—with their families—if we can, so that when you have a person whose ability to manage his own affairs physically is diminishing, we will try then to coordinate with some younger member of the family with whom we may be able to make arrangements.

The problem of finding small quarters in the District of Columbia does not present the problem that locating housing for the larger families does, for the reason that a great many of our older buildings have long since been cut up into small units, so that the availability of units for single people, or for couples, is not the problem.

To go on with the statement that General Clarke made, the National Capital Housing Authority has, of course, long been concentrating on the needs of the elderly people, and we have a somewhat adequate supply of the one-bedroom apartments, which are available for the aged, and a new supply is being planned.

I don't know whether this satisfies the question or not with respect to what is being done to people who are not necessarily involved in an urban renewal program, but get involved in the need of changing their home address for whatever other reasons may occur in the general landlord-tenant relationship.

Senator WILLIAMS. Your services are brought to bear after some action in court really is triggered by someone who does appear for one reason or another at court.

Miss WILKINS. Generally, this would be true, although my services are sufficiently well known now so that at the point when a 30-day notice is given which must precede any court action, we are frequently brought into the picture.

Senator WILLIAMS. How many are there in your department working on this question of relocation?

Miss WILKINS. I have a staff now of eight. I have in addition to myself three social workers, a housing officer, two clerks, or three—two clerks and a secretary.

Senator WILLIAMS. In the legislation that you have worked out, the proposal is that all of this question of relocation be brought into one service?

General CLARKE. That is correct, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. That was not introduced in the Congress. That was developed in the executive branch.

General CLARKE. That is correct, sir. My understanding is that it was awaiting the Federal highway legislation to see what type of proposal came out of that for assistance in relocation and probably will be coordinated now with that legislation.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is the link here of highways and relocation? We read that some of this part of the public works program is being held up on this one proposition, that replacement housing cannot be found for those families that would be dislocated by the highways and freeways.

General CLARKE. Of course, the highways create a substantial loss in the relocation problem. Of the 11,000 families that would be moved over the next 5 years, which I previously mentioned, our current estimate is that 2,800 of those would result from highway problems.

Senator WILLIAMS. Which highway? What highways?

General CLARKE. If I may read these down, the Anacostia Freeway, which is on the east side of the Anacostia River. The 11th Street Bridge approaches. This is the 11th Street Southeast Bridge across the Anacostia River. The Southeast Freeway from 2d to 7th Street SE. The Potomac River Freeway, which is along the Georgetown waterfront. The E Street connection. This is in the vicinity of 26th Street and E Street NW. Interchange C, which is 11th and K SE. The Southeast Freeway from 15th Street to Barney Circle SE. The East Leg, which is the one which you mentioned which had been deferred. The Northeast Leg. I am sorry—the North Leg Interchange, which would be in the vicinity of the Central Leg and the North Leg of the Inner Loop. The Northeast Freeway, which would be paralleling the B. & O. Railroad up to the Fort Drive area and joining with the third route to Baltimore. The Center Leg, which is planned in the area between 2d and 3d Streets W. Vermont and Florida Avenue channelization. This is a local project, with 25 units involved. And Missouri and Georgia Avenue channelization, again a local project, which would have 30 units.

Senator WILLIAMS. You mentioned the major units earlier.

General CLARKE. Yes, sir. The most substantial units with regard to displacement are Interchange C, the Southeast Freeway from 13th

Street to Barney Circle, the East Leg, the North Leg Interchange, the Northeast Freeway, and the Center Leg.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are plans and construction on these being held up in any degree by the problem of relocation?

General CLARKE. Yes, sir. The East Leg, in particular, was one item which we had in our budget for fiscal year 1963. At the request of the majority of the Board of Commissioners, this was removed from our fiscal year 1963 budget because of the relocation problem.

Senator WILLIAMS. I gather the Southwest relocation was accomplished with some—with outstanding success, I believe you said—this has been cited nationally. Is it possible that number of families, 6,000, just about absorbed the relocation market for a while?

General CLARKE. I do not believe so, sir. We are continually adding to our inventory of public housing. Of course, there is a tremendous private housing availability and considerable mobility in the private housing market. As I look at the private housing market, I feel that people are continually moving through it. This is not something which you can compute precisely, but I think it is evident that people are moving throughout the area, vacating houses as they secure more income. They move to a better house.

Our very broad studies would indicate that we should not be complacent about this problem at all, but if we attack it a little more vigorously than we have in the past on a rather unified approach, that I think we can solve the problem of meeting these numbers of 11,000 units over a period of 5 years.

Mr. FRANTZ. General Clarke, would you tell us your view of what are the advantages that would accrue and what problems would be solved by the central relocation service that is proposed by the bill?

General CLARKE. Of course, one thing that our legislation would take care of is the current difference between the allowances paid under urban renewal relocation of \$200 per family and moving costs for commercial enterprise, and the lack of any allowances for payment to families or commercial enterprises under any other program.

Now, the program that we would provide in our legislation would encompass more than highways. It is rather far reaching. It would involve paying relocation costs for any condemnation actions where actual acquisition of property is involved. This would involve school sites, and everything else in which the municipality might engage.

This, I think, is the equalization of payments and providing some degree of equity which now does not seem to exist. Insofar as the combining of the two agencies—as to whether this will provide a more efficient service—this has been debated in the community for several years, and there are schools of thought on both sides. One school is that no particular advantage would be gained by joining the two, and the other feels that by maintaining a central housing inventory and the same records and all, that some efficiency and some administrative simplicity should result.

The Commissioners after considering this matter for a long time took this latter view; that we felt by combining the two we could achieve a higher degree of efficiency and perhaps some administrative simplicity in the operation. This has not been without considerable debate throughout the community, I assure you, sir.

Mr. FRANTZ. Has there been a problem of coordinating the anticipated use of relocation units, where you had more than one public program depending on the same units for relocation?

General CLARKE. To my knowledge, no, sir. Perhaps Miss Wilkins could speak more learnedly on this. I don't know of any real conflict. I would rather Miss Wilkins or Mr. Doyle answer that question.

Miss WILKINS. There are indeed systems of priority which put, as you suggest, or establish a competition for the housing that there is. Now, with respect to private housing, I would suppose that, even though there are two separate units, the operation is on an even footing as to who can provide the type of tenants that the private realtors or agents are willing to accept, and so that, while there may be two people applying, the housing of both individuals, of course, is important.

Now, with respect to public housing, this is a different situation entirely.

As you gentlemen probably know, the organization of the District of Columbia is peculiar with respect to the Federal interest and control in various parts of our Government and the local interest and control.

The basis for the legislation which sought to unify this whole area of urban renewal sought to overcome that. You have the National Capital Housing Agency, which is a Federal agency established to provide housing for the low-income families in the District of Columbia.

You have the Redevelopment Land Agency, which is a Federal agency established to improve the living conditions in the District of Columbia.

Now, these two agencies had an understanding so that people displaced by the Redevelopment Land Agency were given top priority for public housing. This meant, of course, that families displaced, by other than the Federal programs, could not have top priority and, therefore, had to have a subservient priority. Now, this created considerable hardship to the families that were so unfortunate as to be displaced by other than a Federal urban renewal program. And I think this answers your primary question as to the competition for these units.

At the moment, the Redevelopment Land Agency has been able to have rehoused, by the National Capital Housing Agency, nearly all of the families that their programs have displaced. I think, at last report, there were some 39 families still pending.

The families which have been displaced, or threatened with displacement in the local program, are still, of course, on the waiting list.

My figures show that about three-fourths of all families displaced by local programs appear to be eligible for public housing.

Out of a total of some 1,410 families which have come through my service, between March of 1960 and September of 1962, some 1,007 had been referred to the Public Agency as apparently eligible for low-rent housing, and 305 had actually been housed by the Public Housing Agency.

So that we have about—these figures would indicate—five-sevenths of all those that came through my service would need low-rent housing, but only one-third of those referred, thus far, have been able to get into the public housing units.

The families, chiefly, that I deal with, to divert attention momentarily from the aged program, are, generally speaking, the low-income, large families. Whereas the normal, or average, American family is thought to be three point-something people, my families will range 6.57 people.

This is the big problem in the District of Columbia, and it reacts all the way down the line.

I think, generally speaking, our older people—that is, the single or the couples—fare rather well with what the District has been able to do and plan for this group.

Unhappily, we have not been able to provide as bountifully for the young growing families with small incomes who are not yet able to improve their housing situations and step up into the housing that is left vacant by those of better means.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. General Clarke, did I understand that you felt that there would be sufficient private housing available within time because the market is fluid here in the District? Did I understand your statement correctly?

General CLARKE. No, sir, I do not believe there will be sufficient private housing to take care of the needs.

I think we have to put more emphasis on the construction of low-income, low-rental, private housing. And we need more public housing as the figures are available today. We need substantially more than we have.

My feeling was this: That we could solve the problem of the load of 2,200 families per year average over the 5 years from all of the programs we can foresee by a combination of increased public housing, increased low rental, enough low-rental housing, and with a great deal of reliance on the existing private housing market, that we could solve this problem.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. The reason I ask that, on the question of the reliance on the existing housing market, is the problem that was just touched upon that you spoke of, the one that private housing is expensive, and, therefore, the low-income group, and also this problem of not being available because of discriminatory practices of those people who would be in need of housing, the competitive factor—the landlord has two tenants to choose from—and I was reading in the Post yesterday—they were discussing the holding up of these projects—public and private housing in cities is not adequate to meet the specific needs of displaced families, many of whom are Negroes with low incomes.

My question is: "Does the District have any sort of plan for solving this problem," because I do not think there is any question that private housing is costly and there are realistically certain discriminatory practices.

General CLARKE. Our plans, as I see them, sir, are the emphasis in all three fields: the new supply of public housing, and which we are underway at the moment. We have hearings being scheduled next week on sites for 1,100 new units.

We are working as actively as we can in trying to solve this problem of finding land at reasonable cost to take care of low-rental housing. We have several groups that are interested in investing money in those if we can bring them together with a piece of land. We are still working on that.

We have our Urban Renewal Council, our Citizens Urban Renewal Council, plus our own Urban Renewal Office, working actively in this area.

The third aspect of this is that in our planning for the new urban renewal areas, being specific, with regard to the Adams-Morgan area, the Northwest No. 1 area which is west of New Jersey Avenue here in the second precinct and in our discussion of the possible uses of Bolling Field, if we ever get Bolling Field, we would make provision in there for both public housing and for low-rental housing. I think we have programs underway.

We have just begun our studies under the HHFA grants on the community renewal program. We need to know a lot more about the people who are involved in these programs than we currently know.

We are adding to our future highway engineering consulting contracts a requirement for more information on the economic status and the sociological problems involved with our particular highway routes, rather than depending on the more general census type data that we now have available. We have to become much more specific about the individuals involved so that we can treat them as individuals rather than large groups. You cannot work with a large group. You have to, finally, get down to the individual and find a house for him.

I think all the agencies who are concerned with the problem today feel that the most serious problem is the large family with low income.

Our new 1,100 housing units that we are speaking of, about half of those will be 3-bedroom or larger, in an attempt to work toward the solution of this, the most serious of our problems.

Mr. VOLKMAN. I understand that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has approved a demonstration project for the District of Columbia, to be sponsored by the National Capital Housing Authority, which will permit them to acquire about 50 houses for the large families on the waiting list, that is to be subsidized in part by the Federal Government. So this problem must be nationwide in character for the HHFA to sponsor this particular project.

Senator WILLIAMS. That was described in the paper this morning.

Mr. VOLKMAN. I did not see it.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will deal with that when we get to Mr. Washington. Also, on the surface, it looks as though it might be another part of the answer. I think that is all we have. We are very grateful, General.

General CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, could I just add one figure to our testimony. We have about 600 units of the 221-type housing under construction in the city at the present time. Perhaps I overstressed the difficulty of finding low-cost land. We have found some.

When I say "we," private enterprise has found some, and we are attempting to assist them in finding more. There are 600 units underway at the present time. Recently about 700-some-odd units have been completed. So it is not a hopeless picture completely, but it is a hard picture and we just have to tackle it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

General CLARKE. I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to testify.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Walter E. Washington, executive director, National Capital Housing Authority.



**STATEMENT OF WALTER E. WASHINGTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY; ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD ARONOV, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR; MRS. OLIVE SWINNEY, CHIEF OF SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICES; WILLIAM PERRY, HOUSING MANAGER, ARTHUR CAPPER DWELLINGS; AND MRS. MARY BENNETT, NURSE IN ARTHUR CAPPER AREA OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. We welcome you to our committee. We are very grateful to you for your cooperation in coming here today.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I thought I would at least expose the committee to a variety of people who could probably do far better than I can in bringing you some specifics in relation to the problems of the elderly.

It is indeed unfortunate that we did not have a little more time to arrange for the presentation of direct testimony from some of our elderly tenants. We were not able in the short time that we had to make the necessary arrangements. However, we have the next best thing, I think, Mr. Chairman, and you can advise me as to how far you would like to go with our presentation.

I have prepared a brief general statement on NCHA's program and our experience in public housing on this subject. I have also with me our chief social worker, Mrs. Olive Swinney, who will be able to shed some light on some case studies that have developed out of our agency's experience, and in addition to that, if the committee so desires, I also have two very significant persons with me that I think can give you some reactions to face to face working with tenants. Mr. William Perry, who is our housing manager at Arthur Capper, where we have the biggest concentration of elderly families; and Mrs. Mary Bennett, a staff nurse, from the Department of Public Health, who is stationed in this project and comes face to face with the needs of elderly families.

I might say additionally, Mr. Chairman, that it may be that after the general statement you would desire to simply ask some of the persons that I have with me questions without their having to present a formal statement.

I was hoping to give the committee as close a feeling to what is happening with respect to the families as possible.

This is my understanding of what you desired and to the extent that we can we hope we will be able to do a little something to shed light on the problem.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly; from the inception of the District of Columbia's program of urban renewal in 1954, the National Capital Housing Authority has been actively identified as an essential member of the team of public agencies employed in the total community attack upon slums and blight. Obviously, the authority's principal service in the urban renewal program is the provision of good housing in a wholesome environment for low-income families displaced by public action, at rents in accordance with the families' income.

Today we are housing approximately 8,000 families consisting of some 40,000 persons. These 8,000 dwellings represent about 3 percent of the total housing inventory of the city of Washington. And I

pause when I mention the fact that we are today maintaining a waiting list which has continuously ranged from 7,500 to 8,000 families during the past 18 months.

As of July 1, 1962, there were 350 elderly individuals and an equal number of elderly couples on the waiting list with very few vacancies to house them. Our experience indicates that once admitted, our elderly tenants generally stay with us until removed by hospitalization, institutionalization, or death.

Frankly, it has become obvious that to handle the elderly relocation problem effectively, we must first increase the supply of housing especially designed for the elderly and particularly the low-income elderly.

The housing authority is now just making a significant breakthrough in this regard. We are eagerly awaiting the start of construction of 4 new projects that will add 469 units to our inventory.

It is hoped within the next 30 days we will be under construction on two of these projects.

All four of the following projects have units designed with special features for the elderly :

	<i>Units</i>
Kentucky Courts in Southeast.....	76
Carroll Apartments in Southeast.....	60
Garfield Terrace in Northwest.....	228
LeDroit Apartment in Northwest.....	105
Total.....	469

As I indicated this is just the beginning. We must increase the supply of such housing if we are to accommodate renewal and all other activities in the workable program and public works in the District of Columbia.

In addition to increasing the supply, it is important to consider size, design, and location of the new supply of relocation housing for the elderly. It serves little purpose to displace the older persons and couples who have clustered in downtown areas, and attempt to move them to outlying areas into apartments on the second and third floors of three-story walkup apartments.

Our experience indicates that the housing to serve elderly persons should be in small projects, designed with features to especially accommodate their needs, that is, elevators, grab-bars, larger door openings for wheelchairs, et cetera.

Moreover, this housing should be located in familiar surroundings where the elderly persons have developed important neighborhood ties.

Today, the authority is exploring two sites for the elderly—one near the northern boundaries established by the downtown progress committee, and another in the vicinity of Judiciary Square. Both of the sites are inlying and both sites are characterized by a large number of rooming houses and tenement houses presently housing an admixture of many racial and ethnic groups. It is my belief that an effort to re-create this pattern which has developed voluntarily would be a considerable force for stabilizing neighborhood values in this community, as well as providing for the needed decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

In assessing the potential effectiveness of various alternatives to improve housing for older people, I wish to submit a few considerations involving the Washington community that bear upon the authority's program:

(1) The majority of older people receive incomes too low in this community to permit them to purchase or rent housing at price levels generally available through unaided private housing. In fact, the majority of the persons and couples 62 years of age and above are well within public housing income limits, and these top limits are \$3,200.

(2) Although substandard conditions in dwellings is a factor, the necessity to share accommodations with other persons, related or unrelated, is more often mentioned by elderly persons and couples as the most important housing deficiency facing them. This suggests the need and desirability of planning and developing more units to especially accommodate the low-income elderly and thus tend to overcome the difficulties, inconvenience, and even fear of this "sharing" deficiency.

I pause for a moment to point out what I think crystallizes this point by a statement by a woman aged 69 who lived in cramped quarters with a married daughter and four children before becoming our tenant.

My daughter and I can be friends again, now that I have my own place.

(3) Since a large number of aged persons occupy the older, central areas of the city, it can be expected that renewal and public works programs will produce larger and larger numbers that will have to be accommodated principally in public housing. Therein lies the great challenge to this authority.

For some years we have felt that new approaches were necessary to meet the housing needs of low-income families, regardless of age or race, under the social and economic conditions prevailing in our community today. For this reason, the authority has sought to develop new and experimental approaches to the basic housing problem, while at the same time making every effort to improve the design and operation of the presently existing types of public developments.

As a beginning, we first turned to study and analyze our own day-to-day operating experience, and to learn from among our 600 elderly tenants, what kind of a program would best serve their needs.

With the cooperation of Howard University's School of Social Work, a study was made in June 1959, of elderly tenants, representing a cross-section of those living in National Capital houses. Extensive interviews were arranged with 100 of these older persons, who not only gave full cooperation in the study, but so enjoyed having someone to talk to, the students could hardly get away.

In the group of 100 tenants studied, 51 had been forced to move because of displacement by Government activities, as against 49 who left their previous housing voluntarily. An inquiry into the previous housing occupied by these persons reveals an interesting variety of situations which I believe will be of some interest to this committee. Twenty-eight of the women had lived 15 years or longer at their previous addresses, while 8 of the men had lived at the same address this length of time. Forty of the 100 had lived alone while the next largest group, 17, had maintained their own establishments with their

spouses, 6 had lived with married children, while 12 had lived in homes of nonrelatives.

The study produced conclusive evidence that much good has already been accomplished with even the limited amount of housing that we have been able to offer for the elderly.

Many of those interviewed expressed satisfaction and appreciation in having comfortable warm shelter, lower rents than they had ever known for comparable housing or even slum housing, improved facilities, a private bath, plenty of hot water, and above all a sense of dignity and worth that they experienced through the friendly interest and helpful attention paid them on the part of management and neighbors.

The study showed that these "oldsters," though forced to manage on extremely low incomes, maintained themselves and their apartments in a very creditable way, and in some instances displayed unusual ingenuity and resourcefulness, helping others they considered more handicapped or lonely than themselves.

We have with us a few pictures showing the development of skills and senior citizens activities at Arthur Capper.

About 50 percent of our elderly tenants are being displaced by various aspects of the urban renewal program. RLA relocation workers do a thorough advance job of preparing the older person for moving into public housing. Where the elderly tenant is not a displaced person, the manager finds it necessary to give more time and care in explaining the lease, rent, and occupancy process.

We find that only a very small percentage of older tenants have had previous experience in signing a lease, so this becomes an event of considerable importance. Through this personal contact the manager can identify special needs and handicaps, and assess the social situation of this person as it may affect future occupancy.

For example, the ability of the older person to read and sign his name is tested at this point. Unfortunately, we have a significant number of older persons who must sign with an "X." However, the management staffs are alerted to these problems and provide substantial assistance where and when it is needed. For instance, the manager of the Arthur Capper dwellings meets monthly with the caseworker and the public health nurse to review the situations of elderly tenants who have particularly difficult social, health, and unit maintenance problems. He has made a special list of 21 elderly people who live alone in his properties, but who are not actually able to maintain themselves adequately. Thirteen of the 21 are old-age assistance recipients. None are willing to concede, and I think this is important, that they need institutional care, so management and the cooperating agencies continue to do the best they can to keep the dwelling habitable, but the effort is far from adequate.

Serious human problems of many varieties confront management daily, creating a feeling of frustration and inadequacy when there is no provision for qualified staff to take responsibility for doing whatever is necessary to solve the exacting problems of the elderly, particularly those suffering physical infirmities.

There is certainly sufficient evidence now available to clearly justify a Federal grant for local authorities, and this should be outside of

the present debt service formula for rent subsidy, so that qualified staff can be hired to give special attention to the older tenants in maintenance and social services.

Moreover, and in summary, as we continue to displace the elderly persons, greater attention must be given to the following:

(1) Relocation near to familiar surroundings, family, church and facilities ties in neighborhoods. To move an elderly person from inlying northeast or southeast or northwest to the far reaches of the city produces a frustrating and discomforting experience on top of the basic uprooting.

(2) Improved physical design which goes beyond the provisions of such features as bathroom grabbars and nonslip floors.

(3) Greater development of interest groups designed to provide leisure time outlets for the elderly and encourage the development or improvement of skills, hobbies, et cetera.

(4) Closer coordination of existing volunteer facilities for friendly visitors, trips, transportation to health, recreational and community services and agencies.

(5) Development of limited employment opportunities for the more active senior citizens.

We are exceedingly hopeful under the new task force concept we might be able to develop some of the features along this line.

The authority's great interest in experimentation and development of better housing for the elderly is predicated upon the belief that it should lead to improved programs for housing all segments of the low-income population. Housing for the elderly must adhere to even higher standards than other housing with regard to safety, comfort, convenience, and supportive services and facilities. Therefore, in my opinion, housing that meets the exacting requirements of older people should provide valuable guidance leading to the improvement of all housing.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the end of the general statement relative to our program and experience in the National Capital Housing Authority, and to the extent that the committee desires, Mrs. Olive Swinney and the other staff members and representatives from the Department of Public Health will be able to get into specific case studies and face to face dealings.

Senator WILLIAMS. I should say your conclusions, I am sure, will be considered in detail as we continue our work on this brandnew subcommittee.

Now, first of all, I am particularly interested in reports that I saw today that a new kind of public housing is going to be demonstrated, taking older homes and rehabilitating them and using them, as I understand it, in the regular public housing sense.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that going to be your project, of course, working with the Housing and Home Finance Agency?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir. I might say there are two projects under consideration. The first, which we refer to as the direct subsidy demonstration which has already been approved in the amount of \$194,000 will permit the Housing Authority to go into and negotiate directly with private landlords for housing, particularly for the larger families displaced.

Under this program we will determine the rent on our normal rent scale that a family can pay. Under the rent scale it may come out to \$50, for example. We will negotiate with the private landlord, and if he sets a rent of \$120 for the structure, under the demonstration program the added \$70 would be paid directly to him, making up his \$120.

The housing that is involved in this demonstration will be up to code standards. It will be inspected by District of Columbia housing inspectors. We will only use those houses that meet housing code standards.

It is felt, Mr. Chairman, that this is a quick and, hopefully, inexpensive method of housing the larger low-income families that are displaced or facing displacement for whom our present supply of units is negligible.

This is one of the demonstration thrusts.

The other thrust at this point is in the application stage, and involves the Authority going into a code enforcement area where the whole movement or trend of the neighborhood is on the upgrade, acquiring the house and rehabilitating it to add to the supply of non-project public housing.

Again, at this point we would be able to apply our income limits and the family would receive the normal subsidy under the program.

The big thrust here is in our ability again to produce relatively quick housing, spread out in the community, hopefully, the low-income families would be adequately housed without being identified as public housing families. They would have a homeownership motivation. We would have a limited amount of maintenance. Both of these demonstrations are being pursued under the provisions of section 206 of the 1961 Housing Act.

I believe that if this project can be proved economically feasible, it will be a great addition to the public housing resource as well as provide an excellent opportunity of getting on with the critical job of housing displaced families. Both of these are in demonstration.

Senator WILLIAMS. I thought one was only in the application stage.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes; one is.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where does the homeownership motivation come under that program?

Mr. WASHINGTON. It comes this way, Mr. Chairman. The units that are selected are spread out in the community. There is only a limited amount of surveillance or supervision offered by management. The family takes a home in a neighborhood without being identified as low income as is the case in large public housing projects. Then the motivation comes from the fact that he is interested in this kind of a setting and all of the forces of the neighborhood and the upgrading process are brought to bear. Management stimulates him to take care of his own grounds, maintain his own property, just as any homeowner would. The family develops the kind of spirit and feeling of responsibility that any private owner develops in his home and neighborhood.

Senator WILLIAMS. And as his income increases, he would go on to actual homeownership?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes; hopefully, but this phase has not been worked out as yet. We would hope he might find himself in a position to acquire the premises.

Senator WILLIAMS. The premises you own, he might be in a position to purchase?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. That idea is in the process of being demonstrated down in Texas with the farmworkers.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes. In the demonstration this could fairly well be one of the end products. I firmly believe that this motivation is one of the great features of our program and more should be done with it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mrs. Jacobs should be here today. She would like to hear about this. Mrs. Jacobs gave public housing and urban renewal a real bulldozer treatment yesterday, mainly on the basis that you are uprooting people from a natural community environment and making them live institutionalized lives, almost. There is a lot in that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I think there is something to be said for that part of the program, Mr. Chairman, but I think, knowing of your great work, and the inspiration it has given to some of us in public housing, we believe that more has got to be done. New methods and techniques have to be adopted. We cannot rest on the old ones and feel that they will fully meet new conditions and change in the evolving metropolitan communities. We are now faced with the problem nationwide 70 percent of our families live in urban communities. I do not think one thrust is enough any more and this is the great value of the 206 demonstrator program.

Senator WILLIAMS. I am sorry we have lost our engineer but it just occurred to me and maybe you folks know whether or not any consideration has been given to the use of the air rights over highways or railroads for housing purposes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would not want to answer for the General. I know this subject has been informally explored in the city and even the problem of building over highway rights-of-way has been suggested.

I do not know that there is any serious or formal exploration being made in the city.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would like to go on and chat here for a long time but we are always faced with the inexorable movement of time.

Maybe my friends of the staff have some questions. We have the pros here.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, you might wish to direct some questions to the other members of our staff.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will postpone that. Maybe one day we will take a little field trip.

Mr. WASHINGTON. We would be delighted to have you.

Senator WILLIAMS. At that time we will be able to be more intelligent about some of the human problems involved.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would like for the committee to consider this an open invitation. We will arrange such a tour at your convenience.

Senator WILLIAMS. If I happen to be away on other matters, maybe our friends of the staff will work it out. I will do it when I get back, at any rate.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Thank you. I only wanted to show for the record that from the standpoint of the social welfare side of it, we have a program that is evolving through the efforts of our own social worker, management, and with the services of the Public Health being brought to bear on the special needs of elderly people.

Senator WILLIAMS. It has been a very inspiring presentation. Thank you all.

Now we have Mr. C. Sumner Stone, Jr., editor, Washington Afro-American.

#### STATEMENT OF C. SUMNER STONE, JR., EDITOR, WASHINGTON AFRO-AMERICAN

Mr. STONE. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. We welcome you before this subcommittee, Mr. Stone, and look forward to listening to your statement.

Mr. STONE. Thank you. My name is C. Sumner Stone, Jr., and I am editor of the Washington Afro-American.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Afro-American considers it a signal privilege to be invited to testify today on the problems confronting elderly residents of our cities because of urban renewal projects and highway construction, and other land redevelopment projects.

While the problems of the aging are universal, the Washington Afro-American has been particularly concerned with the difficulties faced by our elderly Negro residents in the Nation's Capital.

Almost daily, members of our staff come into contact with Negroes, many of whom are elderly, who have come to the end of their rope and have called this newspaper as a last resort. A place to live, the exhaustion of financial resources, the removal from welfare rolls, or the desperate search for employment merely scratch the surface of the myriad problems which elderly Negroes are fighting to overcome every day.

Washington, D.C., offers itself as a most interesting sociological laboratory for an analysis of the problems of the elderly Negroes displaced by land clearance projects for two reasons:

(1) It is the capital of the United States.

(2) It is the only major city in America with a majority of Negroes in its population.

Needless to say, what affects the District's 411,737 Negroes (53.9 percent of the population) has a profound impact upon Negroes throughout America as well as upon America's image abroad.

Eight salient facts determines the scope and depth of the problem with which we are concerned today:

(1) The real estate industry of the District of Columbia has clamped a suffocating bear hug on Negroes in this city, virtually excluding them from desirable middle-income housing (where the need is greatest and most critical) and thereby inhibiting natural social mobility of the Negro population.

(2) Banks will not provide mortgages or loans to Negroes when they attempt to buy homes in predominantly white neighborhoods.

(3) Negroes occupy three times as many deteriorating and dilapidated housing units as their white counterparts. The actual facts on those are: in the Negro housing units of which there are 101,000



in the city of Washington, D.C., Negroes occupy 14,416 units classified as deteriorated. That is 13 percent of the homes and apartments. The comparable percentage for whites is 5 percent of what is known as deteriorated housing.

Because urban renewal and land redevelopment projects seek to revitalize land areas, urban renewal, by definition of this fact, subsumes a pattern of what we in the Negro community term "urban removal."

We feel there is a de facto official conspiracy with real estate brokers to permit slums to exist.

Our position is that the slums exist because the officials in the city permit them to exist.

For example, you were discussing with General Clarke on the Southwest clearance. We have some facts on that area which might be of interest to this committee. Of the entire area which was cleared out of Southwest Washington, 44 percent of the dwelling units had no baths; 21 percent of those units had no electricity; 70 percent had no central heating; 27 percent had an outside water supply; 43 percent had outside toilets; 76 percent of the dwelling units were classified as substandard; 93 percent of the people living in that area were Negroes.

Going back to the salient facts:

(4) Homes for the aged in the District of Columbia are racially restricted and virtually closed to Negroes. Out of 73 homes specifically designed for the aged, only 3 accept Negroes on a paying basis.

(5) Negro families median income, while above the average in America, is still almost half that of white families (\$4,763 for Negro families vis-a-vis \$7,577 for white families). This economic fact restricts the available housing market on the basis of the pocketbook and compounds the social felony of housing restrictions based on color.

(6) Negroes average 3.6 persons per housing unit, while whites average 2.4 persons per housing unit. This tendency toward greater saturation within the Negro community further hastens the deterioration of housing units.

(7) The waiting list for public housing is 90 percent Negro with priorities directed toward veterans, persons displaced by land-clearance projects, and the elderly. As to which comes first in the hierarchy, the Washington Afro-American would submit that the only people who could be completely certain of obtaining an apartment in a public housing project in the District is a 65-year-old veteran who fought in World War I and who has been displaced by an urban renewal project.

(8) Personal care homes, a concept of caring for the elderly which seeks to meet the needs of this group, now exist in the District as a temporary solution. Of 52 such homes, 44 are colored. This is part of a program jointly worked out by the District Health Department and the District Welfare Department in 1960. Because the number of Negro elderly persons has increased at an alarming rate in recent years, this temporary solution has been proposed, but is recognized by both departments as no final answer for homes for the aged.

One interesting fact we find in the District of Columbia in view of the fact it has a majority of Negroes, we have less aged than whites, in fact half as many of the people 65 years or over. We took that as the cut-off point.

In the white communities, there are 48,000 people. In the Negro, only 20,000 are 65 years or older. This is in Washington, D.C.

One explanation is that the Negroes have a life expectancy of 63 years, as compared to 70 years for the whites.

In closing, we would like to point out that racial segregation in housing, racial barriers in private homes for the aged, racial discrimination in employment with its cyclical uncertainties, the official lack of concern of a city administration for conditions in housing and code enforcement in the Negro community, the District's official participation in the conspiracy by roominghouse operators to exploit Negroes and force them to live in conditions sometimes almost sub-human, and the lack of adequate police enforcement of housing code violations represent the conjointment of problems which Negroes—elderly and young—must attempt to overcome.

If this subcommittee, in its deliberations and, eventually, in its report to the Senate, will express its concern about the racial barriers which prevent the full participation of the Negro in America's economic wealth and lend its support to efforts in this direction, the problems of the elderly Negro will fade as rapidly as the problems of the Negro in our society today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you for a very profound statement, Mr. Stone. I am not sure I understand the full import of your conclusion. You are suggesting that Negroes, sharing equal opportunity during their productive years, would come on, after retirement, and have fewer problems?

Mr. STONE. That is right, Mr. Chairman. The greatest need for the Negro elderly in housing is middle income housing and, to some extent, lower income. However, Negroes have a lower median income than whites so this restricts their ability to purchase. Obviously, if they can get jobs on the open market, they can acquire a larger income.

Number 2, if there were more construction of housing geared to the middle income—most of the housing which is constructed today in urban renewal projects are higher income—in other words, the rents in southwest Washington average \$65 to \$70 a month. The rents now in the urban renewal project are as high as \$225 and \$250 a month and as low as \$150. So the Negroes move out of the area; none move in. That is why we call urban renewal urban removal.

Senator WILLIAMS. I can see the point. Six thousand families, better than 18,000 people, were removed from the Southwest.

Mr. STONE. In that number.

Senator WILLIAMS. I suggest we did need renewal down there. Your catalog of the lack of facilities is clear proof that there was need here for a renewal program. Of course, the removal problem is the accompanying part that has not been solved.

Mr. STONE. I think the Redevelopment Land Agencies estimated that roughly one-third of the families moved out of that area get into public housing. That is two-thirds that has to find their way on their own.

Senator WILLIAMS. And very few have moved back.

Mr. STONE. I would say that none moved back.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think those high rise luxury apartments are peopled pretty much by wealthy congressional staff people.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I have just one question for Mr. Stone.

Mr. Stone, facing the realities of the low income of the Negro group, and there has been some testimony before us that there is some dissatisfaction with public housing because public housing units have a stigma, I wonder if you have any comment on that and any comment on what Mr. Washington had to offer on these new programs which, the Senator pointed out, are a new approach to the rehabilitation of existing housing, and he pointed out that this does not have the stigma.

Mr. STONE. Public housing is also becoming known as Negro housing merely because whites have a larger availability of housing. They can move everywhere where Negroes cannot. So they choose public housing as the last resort. One of the problems is to recreate like conditions in the neighborhood.

I do not know if he referred to 6th and H Streets where Negroes, whites, and Chinese live together very harmoniously. If you were to build public housing in that area more than likely it would be inhabited by Negroes. The problem is, "How can you recreate the same conditions?" Mrs. Jacobs mentioned you uproot people from the community. If you have an integrated neighborhood, how can you build public housing that would attract whites? This is a problem that has not been mentioned. This is a stigma known as Negro housing because 90 percent of the people in the public housing are Negroes. This is true in Washington, D.C., and New York City, and other large metropolitan areas.

Senator WILLIAMS. I did have a question on point 8, personal care homes. I do not believe we have heard about these from anyone else.

Mr. STONE. I did not hear about it either, until we did it in a series in our paper and I referred back to it.

Apparently the District Welfare Department revised the housing code to include these personal care homes. They are different from nursing homes which are governed by definite housing codes. But the personal care homes, the person applies to the Health and Welfare Departments for these and takes a course in Red Cross on the care of elderly and how to take care of temperatures and so forth, and they are supervised. Their primary purpose is to provide some kind of home for the elderly. Of course, the greatest need is among the Negro people.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you again.

Mr. STONE. Thank you, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. We have George W. Grier, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

**STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. GRIER, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE,  
WASHINGTON CENTER FOR METROPOLITAN STUDIES**

Mr. GRIER. Thank you, Senator Williams.

Senator WILLIAMS. We do not have a statement from you before us.

Mr. GRIER. No, I want to apologize for the fact that I do not have prepared testimony.

Senator WILLIAMS. There is no rule around here that you have to be prepared.

Mr. GRIER. I was out of town and out of reach for about a week.

When Mr. Frantz was finally able to reach me, it was too late for me to do this. I will try to speak from rough notes. I will be happy to clean up whatever sloppy syntax there may be on the transcript afterward.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is called revising and extending your remarks.

Mr. GRIER. I am George W. Grier, and I am a research associate with the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, which is a nonprofit organization for research and education in urban affairs.

Senator WILLIAMS. How is it financed?

Mr. GRIER. It is financed chiefly by foundation grants and to a minor degree by contracts for research and educational programs. Its major financing comes from the Ford Foundations and the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation.

In the past also, I have performed studies on problems of older people for Brookings Institution and for the special staff on aging of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I would like to warn you in advance that I have little to offer in the way of firm facts this morning. This is because of the serious lack of knowledge on this subject.

Almost nothing of a firm nature is known nationally about the problems of relocation of older people and almost nothing is known for the District of Columbia.

I was very glad to learn that one of your committee's objectives in holding this series of hearings was to remedy this lack.

I might cite one fact which I consider encouraging. I think we can all use a little encouragement this morning. This may already be known to your committee but, if not, there is presently underway under a major grant from the Ford Foundation a large-scale study of the problems of relocation of older people. It is being conducted by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials in conjunction with the Institute of Urban Studies of the University of Pennsylvania. My wife and I are assisting in formulating that program and I would hope that its findings will eventually be of aid to your committee.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is the timetable on that?

Mr. GRIER. It is going to be a long-term study and final results will not be available for several years. I would hope that some preliminary results will be available much sooner.

Senator WILLIAMS. We hope we will be around here and do something about it when that day comes.

Mr. GRIER. I am sure that as much will be done as possible to get results out as soon as they can be formulated. The study is going to be made in a number of cities in order to provide a comprehensive sense of problems.

The Washington Center has also been involved and interested in the problems of housing for older people. It has been working with the National Capital Housing Authority in formulating a program for studying some of the factors providing the best possible public housing environment for older people.

We have not yet been able to get underway on that but we hope to be underway soon.

In light of the general lack of information on this subject, I thought the most valuable thing that I could probably do this morning would be to indicate some areas where I felt that inquiry might be most fruitful and to raise some particular questions that might be useful to explore in future inquiries.

The first point that I would like to make is one that is neither new to your committee nor something that I have not said before—I said it last year to a hearing chaired by Senator Clark—and that is the fact that older people have predominantly low incomes is probably the most important single aspect of their housing problem. I say this not to belabor an obvious fact. But first of all it is an important matter to remember in any considerations concerning the housing of older people generally, and it becomes particularly important when you are considering the displacement of older people from homes that they have previously occupied for a length of time and where they may have a considerable equity.

Figures on the incomes of older people generally tend to conceal a couple of facts of importance.

In the first place, they are usually stated in the form of medians, which means that half of the population receives income below that figure. We tend to forget that half.

Another fact we tend to forget in considering the incomes of older people and the ability of older people to use these incomes in bettering their housing situation is that the older family is inevitably reduced in size as their age increases and this size reduction is accompanied in most cases by a further reduction of income.

Eventually the older family is reduced to one person. If the survivor happens to be a woman, the reduction in income will normally be greater than if the survivor is a man. Since women tend to live longer than men, this fact assumes particular importance.

Nationally, older people living alone and as lodgers had a median income in 1959 of only \$1,053. This is a figure which is shocking in light of our present affluence as a society.

Now, these low incomes mean that older people do not have much of an income cushion to fall back upon if forced displacement by urban renewal or highway programs raises their housing expenses permanently or necessitates emergency expenditures—and both of these things frequently occur. But we do not know very much about the specifics on how elderly relocatees actually meet this problem.

What do they do to deal with increased housing expense if this is required under relocation? What do they do to meet emergency expenditures? We should learn more about these questions.

Secondly, and related to the first point, is the fact that older people do not have much in the way of liquid savings. Surveys have repeatedly shown that older people on the average have greater total assets than younger people. But what is conveniently forgotten by the AMA and by other organizations which persistently try to misuse these statistics is that most of older people's assets are tied up in homes which they own for their own personal use. A home is an item of capital equipment which is essential for living. It is not a

reliable source of emergency funds. Even its value in monetary terms may be lessened if it has to be disposed of quickly under pressure.

Displacement from their homes, especially under condemnation proceedings may not only deprive the older people of the sense of security to which they had felt home ownership entitled them; but it may also bring them a much smaller cash return than they had previously been led to expect they might receive from their house if they had to sell it. This is true for a couple of reasons.

First of all, we tend often to be optimistic as to how much properties would bring if we had to sell them. If a property we own is located in a neighborhood which has been declining physically, we may fail to take this fact into account in our own estimate of its value.

Secondly, a property which is seized under powers of eminent domain may be seized at a value which is less than would be obtained if it were disposed of under more normal conditions. This is not to imply any unfairness on the part of the public agencies involved or of their appraisers. But the very fact that a home is located in an area which has been slated for clearance may be reflected in its market valuation.

Certainly the payments which older people receive for their homes when they are relocated will not be sufficient to purchase equivalent replacement housing in most cases. They are, therefore, faced with a real problem in making what payments they do receive apply toward housing for the remainder of their years.

It is my guess, although I have no firm data on which to support this, that displacement forces many elderly people from an ownership to a rental status. This probably raises the housing costs of many of them at the same time, because it usually costs more to rent a home than to pay the taxes on a property on which you have already amortized the mortgage.

May I just give one theoretical example which may or may not be valid for a substantial number of older people. If an older couple get \$5,000 for their home under relocation proceedings and their housing costs are increased by \$50 a month in the rental unit to which they are moved, then the cash they acquire for their home will be used up in less than 12 years—even allowing for a generous rate of interest if the money is invested. Many older people are living a lot longer than that after they are relocated these days. A man reaching 65 now has about 1 chance in 5 of surviving 20 years or longer. A woman's chances are considerably greater.

In fact, we know almost nothing about what happens to elderly homeowners under these conditions—where they go, how they expend their resources, what techniques might best be used to minimize the financial burden on them.

Thirdly, we tend to think of the problems which displacement creates largely in the framework of inflexibility and inability to adapt to change which we feel are associated with change. I think we tend to pay less attention to what may be even more important, the fact that many older people have lived in their present homes for many years. In the District, the special tabulation of the 1960 census

recently prepared for the HHFA under a special appropriation showed that of about 37,000 household heads aged 65 or older, about 11,000, or nearly one-third, had lived in their present homes since 1939 or earlier. Even for a person as young as 40 who was displaced forcibly from a home which he had occupied for more than 20 years, one would expect some severe repercussions in terms of his living patterns, in terms of his psychological feeling of security and so forth.

I might point out that the need for a secure sense of "home base" begins at a very early age. Few of us have not known a small child who had a favorite blanket or a teddy bear which he carried everywhere for this purpose. This need of attachment to things which are secure and familiar appears quite basic to human beings regardless of age. I believe we need to think of this problem of displacement from one's home in those terms, rather more than in terms of some "special" characteristic of old people per se.

The older person, when he is relocated from a neighborhood where he has lived for many years, has to reorient his pattern of living drastically. He has built up many relationships to his neighborhood and his neighbors. He has learned where to shop, and how to get downtown with a minimum of difficulty. He has a trusted doctor down the street and often a church which has been the center of his religious and social life. All of these things are swept away, and he has to replace them all at once.

My basic point is that we pay too little attention to the psychological shock involved. These problems demand the most sophisticated treatment. We just do not know very much about how best to treat them. We know very little about the specific nature of the difficulties which we suspect may be suffered by older people under these circumstances.

We do not know how their readjustment problems may vary if they are forced to move from densely populated urban areas to the suburbs, if they are forced to move to a new neighborhood where their neighbors differ in age or in background, if they are forced to move from a known home to a rental apartment. All of these problems—economic, psychological, and social—tend to come together in the displacement of older people.

Although I have stressed the problems of owners, and owners have more financial stake in their homes than renters, renters may have just as much of a psychological stake in their neighborhood. Also they may be in considerably more dire economic straits if they are forced to move—because, first, they receive minimum relocation payments, if anything at all, and second, they may be paying very high percentages of their income for rent already.

In the District of Columbia in 1960, the special tabulations of the U.S. Census made for HHFA showed that almost 7,000 out of 16,000 single elderly persons occupying rented quarters paid a third or more of their incomes for rent. We generally talk about one-fifth to one-fourth as about the maximum that people can pay and still have money left for other necessities of life.

Another point—Mr. Stone has already dwelt on this, but I will mention it once more—many areas torn up by highways are Negro areas, and many of the people who are displaced must be Negro. In the District of Columbia about a third of all Negro households with heads 60 years and over have lived in their homes since 1939 or earlier.

We know almost nothing about the Negro elderly or their special problem in housing or relocation.

In something I once wrote on the subject I remarked that one would think from most of the studies of the elderly to date that racial differences ended at age 65. I suspect that a good study would show great differences in their problems from those of the white elderly and would also show that in most respects the Negro elderly are much worse off. Their incomes are lower. Few of them have social security, because many of them have been employed for most of their lives in jobs on which social security conditions were not available until recently. Their savings are probably much lower than white families savings as a result of inadequate incomes, and their housing situation is often poorer than that of whites in similar economic circumstances.

Furthermore, Negroes tend to be more prone to removal by redevelopment than whites because they tend to be clustered in those areas. Fewer of them are homeowners, and thus many of them have the problem of meeting increased rent payments without the aid of any equity savings from their previous homes.

Finally, and for a variety of reasons, it seems to me that public housing is one of the potentially more valuable ways available to us to deal with the problems of elderly relocatees both white and Negro.

I know Mr. Washington and the National Capital Authority have been deeply concerned with this problem. I can only second the portion of his remarks I was fortunate to hear.

We should know much more, however, about how to create the best public housing environment for older people, and how public housing can be used more effectively for solving the problems of displaced elderly persons. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Grier. That was a good statement of many of the problems and a good analysis of many of the problems. We find it very useful.

I do not think we will give you many questions because I believe we promised Mr. Phil A. Doyle an opportunity to be heard at this session. Mr. Doyle?

#### STATEMENT OF PHIL A. DOYLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mr. DOYLE. Senator Williams, and members of your staff, I am delighted you are conducting these hearings because we recognize that if we do not find solutions to some of the pressing relocation problems for both families and businesses, our program is going to be ended.

My name is Phil A. Doyle. I am the Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

Before speaking briefly of the most recent experience of the Agency in relocating a large number of families from an urban renewal area, I should like to say that the problems we encountered were there and would have continued to be there had we not undertaken a project. I haven't positive proof of it, but I believe that within a short time we will have some evidence that families that were there, including the elderly, were probably better off for our having arrived, and, in a sense, uncovering their problems.



If, in any urban renewal area, you were to lift off the roofs of the houses and look into all the social problems that exist, both for the young and the middle aged and the aged, you would, I think, uncover every social disability known to man and some that aren't.

I think that one of the greatest advantages of urban renewal in this country has been that in facing up to the problem of relocating the families and, in fact, lifting these roofs and looking at those social problems they have come to be recognized.

In some later testimony, I will point out some Agency referrals that we made which probably should have been made many years before we arrived on the scene. Now for our experience in the most recent project.

Since June 1960, this Agency has been engaged in relocating 815 families and individuals from Northeast Urban Renewal Area No. 1, an 82.4-acre parcel of land, bounded by North Capitol Street, N Street, Union Station railroad tracks, and G Street, which has been designated as a commercial and light industrial center by the urban renewal plan, an area ideally suited for industrial development or heavy commercial development. Sixty-five percent of the area's dwelling units were substandard.

Of the area's residents, 22 percent, or 183, were 62 years of age and older. These included only 13 couples. The age range was from 62 to 98 years. Forty of these persons were relocated to public housing, the rest to private housing. Six percent of the latter went, on their own, to substandard housing. The Agency is continuing to work with these in the hope that they will accept assistance in relocating to standard housing. Twenty-four of the aged were white, the rest nonwhite. Many had special problems including inadequate incomes, total disability, senility, and other severe health handicaps. Some were unable or unwilling to live alone.

Midway in the Agency's relocation of families from the Northeast, the relocation service added a highly trained casework counselor to the staff. To her office are referred persons whose problems are of such severity that orderly relocation is impossible. The following is a summary of two of the cases of elderly persons who were referred to the family counselor.

In citing these, I am inclined to think that if we were to conduct research, it would be very difficult to categorize these cases. Each one falls into a category of its own.

I would like to leave, with the committee, a summary of a number of cases I am not going to cite, all of which I think are interesting and throw some light on this problem.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you. We will receive them for our record.

(The summary referred to follows:)

#### SUMMARY OF FAMILY COUNSELING SERVICE TO ELDERLY PERSONS

(By Rebecca F. Griffin, family counselor)

Since May 1961, we have assisted at least 12 elderly persons who presented problems which hindered orderly relocation. All were either heads of families or single persons. While the single persons require the greatest service, the others appear to need more supportive help in carrying on their responsibilities at this period in their lives. The situation of the elderly person requires special attention. Hence our request that all such situations be automatically referred to family counselor at time of acquisition of property.

A summary of the cases referred to this office during the past 17 months follows:

## SINGLE PERSONS

(1) Mrs. S., an 80-year-old widow, was living alone in a housekeeping room. There were indications that she had managed independently for many years. However, at the time of acquisition, the relocation technicians found her uncooperative. This was due to senility and the associated fears that her rights were to be withdrawn. Much time was spent in efforts toward working with this tenant before it was realized that this was impossible. There were exhaustive community agency contacts but there was none which could offer real assistance toward getting this tenant properly relocated. Her public assistance grant was withdrawn because of her refusal to sign forms needed for the continuation of her grant. Of course, lack of income compounded the problem. She refused medical and social agency help. These factors, together with the absence of any known relatives, made relocation by this agency virtually impossible. The tenant who remained in an empty three-story building for at least 2 months, finally went to share another housekeeping room with another elderly woman. This is on a temporary basis.

Some of the community contact made were: (1) Public assistance, (2) Woman's Bureau, (3) District of Columbia Adult Mental Health Clinic, (4) St. Aloysius Gonzaga Church; Public Health Nursing Department, (5) District of Columbia Village, and an ad hoc committee of the RIA advisory group.

(2) Mr. D. is an 83-year-old man who has also managed well, and continues to do so. He is without relatives in this city, and he appears to want a person to whom he can turn when he has matters of concern. He initiated the contact with family counselor when he wanted help with tracing his social security check which was overdue. He was relocated to public housing, but returns to Northeast field office whenever he has a problem. It is not easy to sever these relationships, although efforts are being made to redirect him to the assistant manager of his project.

(3) Mrs. B. was a retired widow who lived in a six-room house which showed signs of having been well furnished and maintained. However, she was not so alert when urban renewal activity was begun in the Northeast area. She was eligible for public housing, and appropriate application was made, but such an assignment was subsequently felt to be infeasible. There was evidence of rapid decline to the extent that Mrs. B. could not care for herself. Her eating habits were erratic, and she had complete meals only when someone brought them to her. Her problems were not economic, but were rather the result of senility and its concomitants. Mrs. B. could give no information regarding relatives but with the help of neighbors, RIA located a niece who seldom visited her but who came forth and assumed responsibility for having Mrs. B. admitted to District of Columbia General Hospital and subsequently to the Geriatrics Department of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

(4) Mrs. D. sought help from RLA following her self-relocation. She had availed herself of the service while in the area to the extent of receiving a public housing assignment. She refused the assignment because of the distance from her job. Her dissatisfaction with her plight led her to call and ask for further assistance. It was learned that she was living in very unhealthy basement quarters for which she paid \$66 per month and that she was experiencing some health problems as well as financial distress. Mrs. D. had a married son living in public housing with his family of six who could offer no tangible assistance. In this case, an evaluation was made of her problem and the results were referral to District of Columbia General Out Patient Department; temporary relocation to home of a niece pending another assignment to public housing. Within 2 months, Mrs. D. moved to James Creek Dwellings, and a 6-month followup revealed that she was doing well.

## ELDERLY HOUSEHOLD HEADS

(1) Mr. W., age 72, was found to be unable to care for his own needs. He shared his basement apartment with a woman who cared for him. The presence of this woman prohibited his being considered for public housing. The question arose regarding feasibility of his applying for public housing as against private housing of this couple who denied being more than friends. The latter was the choice of the tenants and appeared to be better for them. Mr. W. had an arrested case of tuberculosis and had recently undergone surgery for

a malignancy. Referral to the Home Care Service at District of Columbia General Hospital resulted in an evaluation by a public health nurse, and the immediate on-site relocation of Mr. W. and his friend for health reasons. This change seemed to do much for both persons. Mr. W. seemed to improve immediately, and he took pride in using his skills in making repairs and in handicrafts toward improving the appearance of his quarters. They managed their meager public assistance grants well. Weekly visits were made for the purpose of offering supportive help to this couple. They were relocated in an apartment in the Northwest section of the city, and at time of relocation, Mr. W. was referred to Fides Neighborhood House, and to the Northwest House for companionship and recreational opportunities. Followup revealed that they were getting along well.

(2) Mrs. W., a 68-year-old woman, was referred to family counselor for assistance in planning for her 44-year-old, epileptic son. Mrs. W. had been sole support of this household, on a grant of \$64 per month, since 1947. Their general living habits were very poor. In an effort to relieve some of the pressure, the son was referred for medical treatment of his epilepsy, and for financial assistance. There was close followup which revealed that he continued his clinic visits, and was better able to adhere to diet because of his own income of \$60 per month.

(3) Mrs. W., 72-year-old grandmother, was left with the responsibility of 9 children, ages 2 to 18 years, when her daughter and son-in-law absconded. This matter had been referred to the Department of Public Welfare, and 5 of the 9 children were removed from the home in order that Mrs. W might be better able to manage the household. Financial assistance came from PAD and some casework services were given by Child Welfare Division. The grandmother was very devoted to the children and did her best. There was, however, some physical and emotional deprivation. The Child Welfare worker and RIA worker worked cooperatively toward relieving some of this distress. Weekly visits were made and referrals for articles of clothing and furniture were made.

This was a tremendous load for an elderly person, but she saw the care of these children as her responsibility. This kind of determination coupled with supportive and some direct service seemed to enable her to continue until the children's parents returned 3 years later.

The family was relocated to private housing and the grandmother's job has been lessened with her daughter's help.

The above-mentioned cases serve to illustrate some of the problems which have come to the attention of the family counselor. There are many other situations with which the relocation technician was faced and to which much time was devoted. We have found much loneliness among older persons, and it appeared that more time is needed to assist them with existing problems and to prepare them for orderly relocation.

Mr. DOYLE. The two I am going to cite follow: One concerns an 80-year-old widow who was living alone in a housekeeping room. There were indications that she had managed independently for many years. However, at the time of acquisition the relocation technicians found her uncooperative. This was due to senility and the associated fears that her rights were to be withdrawn. Much time was spent in efforts toward working with this tenant before it was realized that this was impossible. There were exhaustive community agency contacts but there was none which could offer real assistance toward getting this tenant properly relocated. Her public assistance grant was withdrawn because of her refusal to sign forms needed for the continuation of her grant. Of course, lack of income compounded the problem. She refused medical and social agency help. These factors, together with the absence of any known relatives made relocation by this agency virtually impossible. She remained in an empty three-story building for at least 2 months, and finally went to share another housekeeping room with another elderly woman. This is on a temporary basis.

Some of the Agency contacts were: (1) Public Assistance. (2) Woman's Bureau. (3) D.C. Adult Mental Health Clinic. (4) St. Aloysius Gonzaga Church; Public Health Nursing Department. (5) District of Columbia Village, and an ad hoc committee of the RLA advisory group.

I think this is in many respects a typical kind of situation.

Another case. A Mr. W., age 72, was found to be unable to care for his own needs. He shared this basement apartment with a woman who cared for him. The presence of this woman prohibited his being considered for public housing. The question arose regarding feasibility of his applying for public housing as against private housing of this couple who denied being more than friends. The latter was the choice of the tenants and appeared to be better for them. Mr. W. had an arrested case of tuberculosis and had recently undergone surgery for a malignancy. Referral to the Home Care Service at District of Columbia General Hospital resulted in an evaluation by a public health nurse, and the immediate on-site relocation of Mr. W. and his friend for health reasons. This change seemed to do much for both persons. Mr. W. seemed to improve immediately, and he took pride in using his skills in making repairs and in handicrafts toward improving the appearance of his quarters. They managed their meager public assistance grants well. Weekly visits were made for the purpose of offering supportive help to this couple. They were relocated in an apartment in the Northwest section of the city, and at time of relocation, Mr. W. was referred to Fides Neighborhood House, and to the Northwest House for companionship and recreational opportunities. Followup revealed that they were getting along well.

These are typical situations. According to the census of 1960, 23,702,000 persons or 13.2 percent of the American people were 60 years of age and older. Many undoubtedly face the same problems, as the aged who live in urban renewal areas. Obviously we are going to find many of them in our urban renewal projects. We have been asked to comment on the problems of aged small business persons who are displaced by public programs.

Some 780 businesses were displaced from the Southwest, Washington's first urban renewal area. Most could be considered small businesses. We cannot state, authoritatively, how many were conducted by aged persons. Generally speaking, the impact of urban renewal on small businesses is severe. However, we do not know if it is more or less severe than attrition in small business caused by the relentless economic processes, occasioned by the large shopping center, the dominance of the retail business by the large chain and the general shrinkage of the number of people in that kind of small retail business.

We do know that many aged persons who operate small marginal businesses in old areas of the city are unable to continue to do so in other, more prosperous, modern areas. We know that some welcomed an opportunity to discontinue their businesses; for others it was a problem of the first magnitude. Sometimes more important psychologically than financially.

I have just two recommendations to make. One relates to the displacement of the elderly resident, and that is that the public housing authorization of the Congress be broadened to enable local public housing authorities to build special facilities for the single aged.

These structures, I think, could take the form of residential hotels, in effect, where good rooms would be provided and there would be a central dining room. This would supplement the present program of providing small apartments for either the single or the elderly who need an apartment.

I think without this facility that we are going to find that the aged, whether displaced from our projects or other projects, are going increasingly to land in substandard and marginal privately operated roominghouses.

The other recommendation is in respect to the small businessman. I suggest that a way be found to render them business counseling service.

I think it would be improper for the Redevelopment Land Agency, or for any other local public agency for that matter, to attempt to render this kind of business advisory service. First, because we would not wish, I think, to advise people on how to conduct their business affairs, and, secondly, and possibly more important, I think that the businessman faced with displacement would regard our advice with some suspicion, thinking that we were merely giving it to get the job done.

I thought that perhaps we could involve an association of commerce, a board of trade, some foundation that would put up a small amount of money to staff an office of possibly one person and a clerical assistant, and his sole responsibility would be to render advice to displaced businessmen. This advice might take the form in some cases of suggesting that the businessman in question not attempt to continue but to seek other employment. In other cases, it might take the form of actually suggesting where to relocate.

In my experience, the small businessman is baffled as much by lack of knowledge of where he might render his services as he is by the financial difficulties confronting him.

I have not commented on the psychological problems which Mr. Grier went into. I have full sympathy with them. I think, however, in large measure that these can be largely ameliorated by a sensible administration of a relocation program which relies upon proceeding with deliberate speed, by taking all of the people in the area into your confidence, explaining to them what your relocation program is going to be.

If we could find the economic measures, the social measures that are needed to really deal with the problems, we could by and large deal satisfactorily with the psychological impact of relocation. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you for an extremely fine statement. I wonder, in connection with your small business counsel whether the Small Business Administration would be a good possibility to have such a service.

Mr. DOYLE. I thought possibly another Federal agency, or another local agency, whether it was governmental or not, would be in a much better position than the slum clearance agency itself. Because at least

the advice then would be considered somewhat more objective than if we were rendering that advice or rendering that service.

Senator WILLIAMS. One final question. We have been advised that 6,000 families had to be relocated from the Southwest area that was in the urban renewal project.

Do you have any way of estimating of these families how many might now be in line for another displacement, perhaps of some other project?

Mr. DOYLE. I would not have any estimate of the absolute number or of the percentage. I do believe as we carry on additional urban renewal projects, we are going to find a good many families that were displaced by an earlier one. This is also one of the critical problems in carrying out an urban renewal program.

Senator WILLIAMS. The phrase "pillar to post relocation" has been used to describe people who have been displaced and displaced again.

Mr. DOYLE. On the other hand, I would like to say that the average tenure in both owned and rented apartments and dwelling units of all kinds is about 5 years. So perhaps if you displace a family a second time, say 5 years later, the family might have been about ready to displace if it were an average family.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will recess or adjourn. We adjourn now until we meet again in Newark, N.J. Thank you all for being with us.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned to reconvene in Newark, N.J.)

(The following letter received after the hearing is included in the record:)

WESLEY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1962.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,  
*Special Committee on Aging,*  
*Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: You are to be thanked for your hearings held on "Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly." I attended 1 day of hearings, those in Washington, D.C., on October 23. You may be interested in some comments and one suggestion.

First, I was disappointed that more citizens were not present or making statements. It would seem that several groups of citizens which are concerned about relocation, the aging, or related problems might have been present. No citizens' organization that I know of was contacted or invited to be present.

One vital and quasi-official agency of the city, representing many citizens, yet ignored at the hearings was the Committee on Citizen Housing of the Commissioners' Urban Renewal Council. This committee has devoted much time and attention to the problems of minority groups; the aging population is considered, for our purposes, in this category. This committee is the citizens' group which is required under the workable program for urban renewal.

The Committee on Citizen Housing has just completed and released a 20-page report on relocation in the District of Columbia. I respectfully suggest that a copy of this report be obtained from the Office of Urban Renewal, government of the District of Columbia; and, if you find it helpful, this report might be made an appendix to the published report on the hearings.

Finally, I was extremely disappointed to find Brigadier General Clark representing the District Commissioners at the hearings. His views are poles apart from the majority of District of Columbia residents and, I believe, from those of the citizen Commissioners. It is unbelievable that General Clark could do so unaware of the magnitude of the relocation problem in the District; yet his proposed solution of "a more vigorous effort along the same lines" is naive, and, to me, shocking.

May I express appreciation for your interest and concern on these basic human issues. Let me offer my help and the aid of some of my citizen groups at any time.

Cordially,

CLIFFORD C. HAM.

(The report referred to in the foregoing letter follows:)

COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS' URBAN RENEWAL COUNCIL, COMMITTEE ON CITIZEN HOUSING, BY R. FRANK JONES, M.D., CHAIRMAN

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A CENTRAL RELOCATION AGENCY

The Committee on Citizen Housing of the Urban Renewal Council has been concerned about the relocation problems in the District of Columbia for the 2 years of the committee's existence. On May 22, 1961, the committee adopted a brief statement on relocation. This statement was unanimously adopted by the Urban Renewal Council at its meeting on May 26, 1961, and was recommended to the Board of Commissioners for its consideration and adoption.

At its meeting on Thursday, May 10, 1962, the Committee on Citizen Housing voted to reaffirm its position as presented earlier and as adopted by the Urban Renewal Council. The committee also voted to recommend that the Board of Commissioners not wait for the consolidation of the renewal and housing agencies, but take immediate steps to raise relocation standards and to establish a central relocation agency. The committee agreed to prepare a more detailed statement of its recommendations on relocation. This report expands and amplifies the earlier brief statement. It is submitted to the Urban Renewal Council for its approval and referral to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The following list of recommendations is a condensation of the attached report by the Committee on Citizen Housing of its intensive study of requirements for an effective and efficient Central Relocation Agency.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Enabling authority adequate for establishment of a Central Relocation Agency with adequate funds to provide the following:

- A. An independent, high-level Director.
- B. A sufficient number of trained and experienced staff personnel.
- C. All services needed for satisfactory relocation of families displaced by all Government action.
- D. Moving expenses for all displaced families.

II. Standards for relocation services of the highest level to insure provision of the following:

- A. Notification of an agency's intent to acquire property no less than 6 months prior to actual relocation of the family.
- B. Information re the need for relocation, and about all of the services available.
- C. Guidance and counseling concerning community resources.
- D. Community organization programs for citizen participation of both relocatees and prospective neighbors.
- E. Director counseling services.
- F. Specialized services for specific groups, including those listed in the full report.
- G. Referral services for those needing long-term specialized services available through community agencies.

III. Relocation payments for all families displaced by Government action.

IV. Complete Central Relocation Agency staff to include the following:

- A. Counselors.
  - B. Community organizers.
  - C. Home-finding specialists.
  - D. Housing inspectors.
  - F. Research personnel.
- V. Increased housing supply:
- A. Executive order banning housing discrimination.
  - B. Additional minimum of 8,000 public housing units.
  - C. Increased rehabilitation of existing housing.
  - D. Adequate and continuous housing inventory.
  - E. Long-range relocation planning.

- VI. Questions of basic policy to be considered :
- A. Disruption of family life.
  - B. Available relocation housing supply.
  - C. Long-range metropolitan relocation planning.

## SUMMARY

Inherent in the results of the study and subsequent report, attached hereto, is a major emphasis on the need to plan ahead more realistically as the only answer to the housing and other problems by which the community is constantly beset.

The initiation of the community renewal study is, to say the least, timely and much needed. Although this is no effort to predict what their findings will be, we are confident that, if we are to plan for the future with reality and judgment, the following considerations must claim the attention of the community renewal program staff.

We, therefore, present as important factors for present attention of the Board of Commissioners the following important and basic considerations :

1. A requirement of careful and accurate estimates of future family displacement in the District of Columbia by both public and private sources.
2. The establishment of a maximum figure for the number of families displaced in any one year, unless and until an adequate relocation housing supply is available.
3. Postponement of public works projects until sufficient and adequate relocation housing is available.
4. Provision of relocation services for families displaced by private builders.
5. Exploration and development of ways by which suburban areas can be stimulated to accept a fair share of responsibility for relocation of families displaced in the District of Columbia.
6. Effective use of consultation with citizen leaders and organizations, and full use of advisory committees throughout the decisionmaking process.

*J. Enabling authority adequate for the establishment of a comprehensive Central Relocation Agency*

The ordinance which establishes the Central Relocation Agency should require the Agency to undertake a broad program of services to displaced families. Restrictions should not prevent the Agency from offering the services recommended or any others which aid families in adjusting to change.

The Director of the Central Relocation Agency should not be under the direction of any of the displacing agencies. His position is of such importance that he should be directly responsible to the District Commissioners. He should have a grade no lower than the directors of the displacing agencies and should have free access to those directors.

Employment of a Director on the suggested level will guarantee a highly competent leader; this leader, unencumbered by other departmental responsibilities, can then give the required guidance and direction to the trained and experienced relocation staff necessary for the success of the program envisioned by the subcommittee.

Families are displaced by many types of governmental actions besides urban renewal or highway building projects; such actions include the acquisition of sites for schools, parks, or Government buildings; code enforcement activities and condemnation proceedings; street widenings; public housing programs; acquisition of land by the Architect of the Capitol; and condemnation or purchase of land by other public agencies for a variety of reasons.

A Central Relocation Agency would offer administrative efficiencies and would eliminate confusion, duplication of efforts, and differences in standards of services rendered families. For example, at the present time, one family will be relocated by the Redevelopment Land Agency and receive payments for moving expenses, counseling, and the aid of an aggressive home-finding service. Another family to be displaced, perhaps by highway construction, may receive such insufficient notice of pending displacement and no services at all that the family finds it difficult to locate adequate housing.

Whenever any family is displaced by any form of governmental action, that family should be offered relocation aid.



Cooperation from all displacing agencies and from housing agencies will be mandatory if relocation is to succeed. The District Commissioners have a responsibility to require such cooperation from agencies and departments under their control.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, recommends that adequate enabling authority be provided in the establishment of a Central Relocation Agency and that, in the initial legislation, sufficient funds be made available to the Agency to insure the employment of an independent Director; and of a competent staff with ability and experience; identical services to all displaced families; and payment of moving expenses.

## *II. Standards for relocation services*

Relocation should be seen as a positive effort to develop stable and satisfactory living environments, and to strengthen the total pattern of citizen participation in community life.

The Committee on Citizen Housing believes that serious personal and community problems are caused or aggravated by family displacement. All families will experience certain problems inherent in relocation; a few families already facing serious difficulties may reach the point of total breakdown.

Communities also suffer from the impact of relocation. In the area where public works are taking place, social organizations such as civic groups or churches may lose leadership as well as membership and face disruption, or even disbandment. At the same time, other areas in which the families are relocated may become disrupted by the immigration, as leadership of long standing may move out and tensions develop because of the change.

Services to businesses facing relocation are seen as a necessary part of relocation efforts; such services would be especially appropriate where owners are faced with difficult relocation problems due to discrimination based upon race, color, creed, or national origin. The committee feels that such relocation services are the responsibility of a Central Relocation Agency; however, the standards of services and other details are not further considered in this statement.

Every family displaced by governmental action, tenants, or owner-occupants, should have available the total range of services. Individuals living alone or as roomers or boarders should henceforth be considered as families and similarly entitled to the use of relocation services. Subfamilies or secondary families living in households with other families should receive attention and aid in relocation; some of these may choose to establish separate households at the time of moving.

Solution of these problems can be achieved only by provision of the following services for all relocatees:

*A. Notification.*—Every family to be displaced should receive early and adequate notification. This notice, in writing, should be given wherever feasible during a personal visit by one of the relocation staff. Families should receive such notice as early as possible, but no less than 6 months before the earliest likelihood of removal, except in the case of emergency condemnation procedures for health or safety measures. Notification should include the tentative date when removal would be required. In order for this schedule to be followed, each displaced agency should notify the Central Relocation Agency of the addresses of families to be displaced at least 9 months prior to the earliest date of displacement.

*B. Information.*—During the first visit with each family, the relocation specialist should carefully explain the need for relocation. He should detail the various governmental aids and services which are available to displaced families. The relocation specialist should stress the availability of counseling on all aspects of the relocation process and encourage the family to make utmost use of all services available.

*C. Guidance and counseling.*—Counseling services should include the following: Information on mortgage aid and assistance in home purchasing and mortgaging; guidance in the selection of standard housing and information on home-finding assistance available from the Relocation Agency; instruction on the avoidance of blighted or slum areas; advice on availability of Government or private agencies for family or personal counseling; instructions on moving and the moving allowances; encouragement of families to participate in neighborhood or community organizations.

*D. Citizen participation.*—Families should be encouraged by community organization specialists to participate in community groups which exist or may be formed while relocation is pending. Through such participation, displaced families can work together with other families to maintain the area at least until they move. Tensions and fears can be alleviated by discussion and full awareness of procedures and the rights of the citizens. Families may be able to have a small share in the planning or effectuation of the project as long as they are in the community. Attention is called to the organization of citizens in the Northeast No. 1 project of the Redevelopment Land Agency; the citizens assisted in getting a recreation center into operation even though relocation was pending. The morale of the area was improved and services continued to be available to the families.

*E. Direct services.*—Certain direct services to families may be necessary or desirable during the process of relocation. Some families may need to be personally guided in the selection of homes. Other families may need furniture to take advantage of better housing. Many families will need assistance in budgeting or in financing their housing. The committee commends the Redevelopment Land Agency for providing such services during relocation for the Southwest and recommends that the Central Relocation Agency be allowed and encouraged to provide such direct assistance to families in need.

*F. Specialized services.*—Special care in relocation must be provided for certain families and individuals. A minority of families will be already suffering from a multiplicity of problems and will not be able to surmount the additional obstacle of relocation without intensive aid. Families and individuals requiring specialized services and consideration include the following:

- the aging or the aged;
- families or individuals presently self-supporting, but depending for livelihood upon the house being taken;
- large families; and to a certain extent, all families with children;
- families which because of race, creed, color, or national background, or other circumstances, face discrimination in locating replacement housing;
- low-income families or economically marginal families;
- recent migrants to the city;
- the so-called homeless men or skid-row dwellers.

*G. Referrals.*—Continued help should be available to each family until it has moved into its new home. During the relocation process, other community agencies and services should be utilized wherever possible to aid in the adjustment of the displaced families. A relocation specialist should make at least one personal visit to each family at its new location. Where special problems continue to exist or where adjustment may be slow or difficult, referrals to appropriate public or private agencies should be made.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, recommends that the government of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital and object of worldwide scrutiny, develop the highest standards possible for relocation services to families and businesses displaced by public action.

### *III. Relocation payments*

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends that payments for moving expenses be made to all families displaced by Government action. These moving allowances should be based upon actual need; they should be ample enough to prevent the occurrence of financial hardship to families as a direct result of relocation.

### *IV. Staff of the Central Relocation Agency*

The positions recommended in this report are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of functions, but are those selected for special attention.

A. Some members of the relocation staff should be trained counselors in order to provide the guidance and counseling services listed above under II, C.

B. Community organization specialists should be on the staff to work both in the community from which families are being displaced and in the communities where substantial numbers of displaced families are likely to move. In the neighborhoods where displacees may move, community workers can help to lessen tensions among the residents and help them to accept newcomers. Assistance should be provided to conserve the values of neighborhoods affected. Where community groups do not already exist, the community organization workers should stimulate their development.

C. The relocation service staff must include personnel with specific responsibility for aggressive home-finding endeavors to meet the particular needs of each family or household. Some of the staff working for the Central Relocation Agency should be familiar with real estate and with real estate operations. Close relationship should be maintained with private real estate dealers and also with agencies such as the National Capital Housing Authority. The staff may find it necessary to discover other means of locating available housing and so should have the requisite skills and knowledge of the housing market.

D. The staff should include persons skilled in housing inspection to apply the District of Columbia housing regulations to potential relocation homes. All homes rented or purchased by displaced families should be inspected and approved as decent, safe, and sanitary. Where a family has, by its own efforts, selected substandard housing the Agency should endeavor to relocate the family in standard housing.

E. The Central Relocation Agency must have staff members who can make use of available housing statistics and data from the U.S. Census, the proposed housing inventory, and other sources; who can collect and analyze necessary data on housing and on family characteristics; and who can carefully prognosticate specific housing needs for displaced families. Other areas of research should be undertaken by these skilled employees for broad understanding of relocation, its effects, and future requirements.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, recommends that staff positions in all the foregoing categories be established to provide desirable relocation services.

#### *V. Increase of the housing supply*

*A. Removal of discriminatory restrictions.*—The government of the District of Columbia should encourage the provision of housing by private enterprise as far as the private market can provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for all families and various types of households. Wherever the private market does not or cannot provide adequate housing or where housing is restricted to certain segments of the population, the Government has an obligation to seek other means of providing decent housing. Other groups than those normally operating in the field of housing can be encouraged to sponsor good housing for disadvantaged citizens or the Government can provide decent housing itself. The Government has an obligation to use its powers to eliminate unfair restrictions on the sale or use of housing and to encourage the freest choice of housing for all. Adequate relocation in the District will be hampered as long as the supply of housing for certain families is unavailable or restricted. The Committee on Citizen Housing urges that the government of the District of Columbia take every step possible to encourage the provision of more housing within the District, especially housing for low income and minority families.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, recommends that the District of Columbia Commissioners issue an executive order banning discrimination in housing in the District of Columbia.

*B. Increased public housing.*—In the area of low-income housing, particularly where family incomes are under \$4,000 per year, the public has a major responsibility in building and maintaining decent, safe, and sanitary homes. More than 48,000 families in the District reported incomes under \$4,000 for the year 1959. There are approximately 8,000 units of low-income housing available in the city under the supervision of the National Capital Housing Authority; at least another 8,000 families are on the waiting list for these units while other families have been discouraged from filling out an application. Families without high priorities, either displacement or a veteran's preference or both, have little opportunity to enter public housing.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, recommends that the number of public housing units for the District be greatly increased and suggests that the number of units be doubled in the next 10 years. Many of these housing units should be planned for large families.

*C. Rehabilitation of existing housing.*—The city government should play a major role in the prevention of deterioration throughout the District; it should seek to broaden the provision of adequate community services and facilities, especially requiring rigid housing inspection, thorough street cleaning and trash collection, and the best possible schools, parks, and recreation. The District of Columbia government must take a more active part in curbing the activities of speculators and unscrupulous real-estate dealers who exploit racial prejudices

and panic neighborhoods, destroy stable communities, and limit the supply of good housing. The city should encourage civic groups such as Neighbors, Inc., which seeks to maintain a fine living environment and an inclusive community in the north Washington area. Such existing areas will continue to provide the major source of relocation housing and must be conserved.

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends, therefore, that the supply of homes for families with low or moderate incomes be increased by the rehabilitation of existing dwellings and the conservation of the many fine homes now available in most parts of the city.

*D. An adequate and continuous housing inventory.*—The District of Columbia must have an adequate and comprehensive housing inventory before realistic relocation programs can be established. At the present time, the need for additional housing is the subject of speculation; estimates of need depend primarily upon the preexisting philosophies of those making the estimates. It will be essential for a relocation program that facts on the District housing supply, both present and future, and housing needs be available. It should be pointed out that a housing inventory must be kept up to date through continual resurvey and continuous recording of changes in housing supply or demand.

A housing inventory must contain basic data on housing and more information than is now contained in the U.S. Census of Housing or existing District records. One essential piece of information now lacking from many of the records on housing is data on the availability of housing. This would show whether units are vacant and available for sale or rent; and if being offered for sale or rent, whether they are available for minority-group families, for aging persons or couples, for families with children, or for other families.

Essential to the planning of relocation services will be careful estimates of the number of families to be displaced in the future. At present, such estimates from various departments or agencies serving the District appear to be largely guesswork. Estimates vary several thousand families in their forecasts for the next 5 years. No clear policy seems to exist locally or in the Congress on the amount of displacement which is desirable or manageable.

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends, therefore, that careful estimates of future family displacement, and the development of a planned program for scheduling public works which displace families be the first concerns of the Central Relocation Agency.

*E. Long-range relocation planning.*—Essential to a healthy city and to efficient relocation procedures will be long-range relocation planning. Just as public works and municipal expenditures are programed over a long period of time, so must information on potential displacements of families be obtained for effective planning of relocation loads. Factors such as composition of families, income, race, special social problems, or community structures, should be ascertained so that tentative plans can be started.

Agencies in the city government as well as private housing corporations should be alerted to the prospective needs for additional housing. The National Capital Housing Authority, in particular, must be able to plan for necessary relocation housing 4 or 5 years before relocation so it will have units available for eligible families displaced.

Further, relocation planning should proceed in conjunction with financial, engineering, architectural, or other planning for public works and be seen as equally essential.

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends, therefore, that planning for relocation begin at least 5 years prior to possible displacement of families and that additions to the housing supply be programed so that units are ready for occupancy when families are displaced.

#### *VI. Questions of basic policy in relocation*

Several basic questions of public policy are raised by relocation. It is the obligation of the government of the District of Columbia to seek answers to these questions and to establish a firm policy basis upon which public programs and subsequent relocation can proceed.

*A. Disruption of family life.*—How much disruption of family and community life can a city allow without endangering the values of a stable and well-organized city? What is the risk, in large-scale relocation efforts, of a disorganized and fragmented city? Families and individuals are disturbed by enforced moving but so are businesses, social organizations, and the institutions of the community and sometimes whole cultural or ethnic communities. The practices

and unwritten values of a neighborhood are destroyed as too many of the leaders are moved out or too many families uprooted. Mobility, transiency, and relocation all tend to promote a sense of impermanency, irresponsibility, and apathy which can overcome the stabilizing and conserving influences. If an excessive number of families must be relocated in order to carry out proposed public projects, the city must decide whether the projects are of sufficient value to risk the destruction or deterioration of social values.

On the other hand, enough clearance of substandard housing must be carried out so that the worst housing is demolished and standards are continually raised. Improvements must be made in highways, schools, and governmental buildings so that the city can function efficiently and continue to provide adequate services and amenities for its residents, workers, and visitors.

Long-range programing of public works with careful prognostication and scheduling of relocation loads can somewhat mitigate the community disruption. Still, a maximum figure should be established and no displacement allowed beyond this maximum.

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends, therefore, that the total displacement by all public agencies in any one year should probably not exceed 1 percent of the total number of housing units in the District of Columbia.

*B. Available relocation housing supply.*—Another basic policy question concerns the supply of available relocation housing. Families which face relocation are often those with the least resources and least able to make satisfactory adjustments in community living. If these families cannot be assisted to find decent, safe, and standard housing, they easily drift into already overcrowded houses or communities and increase the deterioration. Public policy today increasingly assumes that when a governmental agency takes away a family's dwelling unit, that Government has a moral responsibility to provide not only the legal minimum of "just compensation, but to assure the availability of satisfactory housing. Financial payments are not always equivalent to the value of a home, especially if no replacement home is available, if the family would not be welcome in the housing it might choose. Enough emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that replacement value involves human as well as economic values.

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends, therefore, that where sufficient and adequate relocation housing is not available, public works projects be postponed until housing is constructed or otherwise made available.

*C. Long-range metropolitan relocation planning.*—Another matter for policy decision concerns metropolitan relocation planning for the District of Columbia. Questions being asked by many leaders include the following: "What is the District's share of lower income or minority group families?" "Should the District house all Negro families while the suburbs continue as a 'white noose'?"

Failure of the suburbs to develop low-income housing and to welcome minority families places a burden of responsibility upon the District which taxes its capacities. The committee supports the development and extension of communities with balanced and heterogeneous populations.

The successful operation of relocation services as heretofore suggested will require substantial appropriations. While this burden falls heavily upon the District and its taxpayers, the entire metropolitan area benefits from the public works programs within the central city. The entire metropolis will benefit if relocation services with the highest standards are provided.

The Committee on Citizen Housing recommends, therefore, that the District Commissioners explore fully ways by which the suburban areas will accept a fair share of responsibility for the relocation of displaced families.

*D. Citizen-government participation in relocation planning.*—Decisions on public projects are a matter of broad public concern. The repercussions of building projects and consequent relocation drastically affect the lives of District residents. Recommendations on relocation and its consequences should be sought from interested citizens, advisory committees, civic groups, and the competent research organizations which are located in the Washington area. Human welfare must be considered over and above the physical rebuilding of the city, and as much as the economic well-being of the city.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, urges the Board of Commissioners to consult with civic leaders and concerned citizens throughout the decision-making process, and consult regularly with its advisory councils.

*E. Families displaced by private action.*—The provision of relocation services for families displaced by private action is another undecided policy matter. This also is a concern of the Committee on Citizen Housing.

The Committee on Citizen Housing, therefore, recommends further study of this matter. It will make further recommendations on the subject at a later date.

*Family displacement forecast<sup>1</sup>—5-year period, fiscal years 1963 to 1967, inclusive*

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	Total
<b>By all agencies:</b>						
District government.....	776	1,799	1,229	1,671	1,589	7,064
Others.....	203	510	860	1,050	1,300	3,923
Total.....	979	2,309	2,089	2,721	2,889	10,987
<b>District government agencies:</b>						
Condemnation Board.....	217	210	215	220	225	1,087
Department of Licenses and Inspections:						
Housing Division.....	145	145	145	145	145	725
Zoning Division.....	100	100	200	200	150	750
Department of Highways and Traffic.....	140	450	550	690	970	2,800
Department of General Administration.....	174	894	119	416	99	1,702
Total.....	776	1,799	1,229	1,671	1,589	7,064
<b>Other agencies:</b>						
Redevelopment Land Agency.....	83	400	750	1,050	1,300	3,583
National Capital Housing Authority.....	120	110	110	-----	-----	340
Total.....	203	510	860	1,050	1,300	3,923

<sup>1</sup> Displacement figures submitted by the Department of Highways and Traffic, the Department of General Administration, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and the National Capital Housing Authority represent maximum estimates. These figures will be reduced should Congress or the Housing and Home Finance Agency not allocate funds or approve projects programed for the 5 fiscal years indicated.