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ABSTRACT

RESIDENTIAL RELOCATION PLANNING IN MASSACHUSETTS

by

Robert Gelardin

Submitted to the Department of City and Regional Planning on June 20, 1966 in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of City Planning.

In Massachusetts, displacement of people by eminent domain is increasing, primarily because of an expansion of urban renewal and public works activity.

The problems of residential displacement are outlined as seen from the points of view of the people affected, the cities affected, and the Commonwealth.

Current relocation practice of agencies in Massachusetts is examined in some detail. First, the legal basis of relocation planning is evaluated. Then, the policies, procedures, and attitudes of relocation agencies are discussed, followed by detail on the social characteristics and needs of dislocated households, and the effectiveness of agency procedures.

The conclusions of the study are presented under six headings:

- resolving conflict between programs.
- estimating housing supply and demand.
- anticipating household relocation problems.
- feed-back of housing and other relocation problems to project design and timing.
- upgrading relocation assistance.
- supporting programs and policies.

Thesis Supervisor: Bernard J. Frieden
Title: Associate Professor of City and Regional Planning
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an exercise in program development. Now is a good time to consider the problems and opportunities of relocation planning in Massachusetts.

A few months ago, in December 1965, Governor Volpe approved a statute providing for state review of relocation plans and performance wherever more than five families are being displaced by eminent domain.

The newly formed Bureau of Relocation, in the Division of Urban Renewal, will be the reviewing agency. Staffing and procedures for this agency have not yet been fully worked out, and may be subject to the influence of timely documentation and recommendations.

The development of this thesis relies on information from the literature, responses to a questionnaire on family relocation, interviews taken, and meetings attended.

Part I outlines the general characteristics of past and anticipated residential displacement in Massachusetts. Useful sources for this were the questionnaire, and the Part I Applications for Loan and Grant on file at the Division of Urban Renewal.

The discussion in Part II of the problems and opportunities characteristic of household dislocation draws from articles by Chester Hartman and Herbert Gans in the Journal of the American Institute of Planners, from the Castle Square Project of Boston, from the Southwest Demonstration Project of Washington, D. C., from Relocation, a report of the Advisory Commission for Intergovernmental Relations.
(ACIR), and from the book, The Elderly in Older Urban Areas, by Niebanck and Pope. The many conversations held and meetings attended also helped in identifying the problems and opportunities of relocation.

Current relocation practice is the subject of Part III. The first section of Part III is a brief developmental history of the complicated legal basis of relocation planning. Sources here were the General Laws of the Commonwealth, the final report of the Commonwealth's Special Commission on Low-Income Housing, and synopses of federal legislation. The ACIR report Relocation was a particularly valuable source. Mr. James Terry was especially helpful on Massachusetts statutes.

Sections B and C of part III concentrate on policies, procedures, and attitudes of relocation agencies. Massachusetts agencies were studied through questionnaire, personal interview, and at meetings of the Advisory Committee for Relocation. For comparison, the experience of New York State and New York City were studied in two days of interviews.

The questionnaire, product of two months study and revision, seeks, among other things, documentation of household characteristics and needs, agency staffing and procedures, whether the clientele was reached, and whether the clientele was helped. A computer program has been written to process the short answers. The processing consists of a counting operation (which produces almost twenty tables of cross-tabulated information), and also a correlation analysis involving sets of paired variables.

As far as I know this is the first time that a systematic
questionnaire study of relocation has been attempted on a statewide basis.

Finally, Part IV will summarize the findings documented in the report, and make recommendations for relocation planning in Massachusetts.

Many people have assisted me in preparing this study. Particular gratitude is due to Deputy Commissioner Julian D. Steele, and members of his office in the Division of Urban Renewal. Julius Bernstein, Frank Drowne, James Drought, Chester Hartman, Charles Liddell, John Powers and Walter Smart, Technical Members of the Advisory Committee on Relocation were very helpful in conversation and general discussion of relocation problems. I also wish to thank staff members of redevelopment agencies who assisted very generously. Professors James M. Beshers, and John T. Howard, of the City and Regional Planning Department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are also thanked for their helpful criticisms. I am very grateful to my principal advisor, Professor Bernard J. Frieden, for his great assistance in the development of this thesis.
I. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PAST AND ANTICIPATED RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT IN MASSACHUSETTS

On the basis of questionnaire returns from thirty-seven redevelopment agencies,¹ the Department of Public Works, and several score Town Planning Boards, the displacement of households in the Commonwealth has been estimated:

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Urban Renewal</th>
<th>Dept. Public Works</th>
<th>MBTA</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 Est.</td>
<td>3686</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 Est.</td>
<td>6424</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1966 and 1967 estimates of displacement for the Department of Public Works is particularly uncertain as to size and timing. The
Metropolitan Boston Inner Belt is the major source of uncertainty. If this road is approved for its present alignment, it will displace about 3,500 families. This number is in addition to other public works displacement around the state.

It is clear from the table that greatly increased displacement activity can be expected in the near future.

The workload differs slightly from displacement. Displacement is measured as the number of households per year on sites at takings; workload is the number of households eligible for relocation assistance and/or payments per year.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Urban Renewal</th>
<th>Dept. Public Works</th>
<th>MBTA</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>899</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. 1966</td>
<td>4589</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. 1967</td>
<td>7582</td>
<td>3354</td>
<td>4135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is estimated that the workload incidence will increase from approximately two out of every thousand urban households per year to almost six out of every thousand urban households per year. Put another way, the annual workload will increase from roughly 8,000 people in 1965 to 25,000 people in 1967.

What kinds of people are being displaced? Do they have financial resources, psychological flexibility, and freedom of movement in the housing market? Or are they people likely to experience
difficulty in relocating?

To the present, urban renewal has been the largest displacing program in the Commonwealth, displacing no less than 65% of all families forced to move. The family composition of the Urban Renewal displacement for 1964 and 1965 in the Commonwealth is summarized in Table 3.3

In the State, 61.7% of urban renewal displaced families are poor, 20.0% elderly, and 57.6% non-white. The actual percentage in individual cities and SMSA's varies, but it appears that, in general, the cities of larger population have a higher incidence of poor, elderly, and non-white among relocatees.

In Table 4, the two year dislocation rate of types of families is shown. Based on the types of households surveyed on property to be taken in the most recent project of each agency, an estimate is made of the numbers (per 1,000 poor and per 1,000 non-white families in the city's population) of households who would be displaced in a two year period at the agency's 1964-65 rate of displacement.5 For example, in Brockton the two year rate of displacement of non-white families would affect 375 out of every 1,000 non-white families in that city.

From Table 4, it appears that if communities maintain their recent renewal emphasis, they would over a period of years, move substantial proportions of their poor, and non-white families.

It has not been possible to develop the same detail on families displaced by other agencies, of which the Department of Public Works is the most significant. A future project might be to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total for Urban Renewal</th>
<th>Percent Poor</th>
<th>Percent Elderly</th>
<th>Percent Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cities Aggregated By Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pop. Under 10T</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 10 and 25 T</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 25 and 50 T</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 50 and 100 T</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Over 100 T</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SMSA'S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>69.6</th>
<th>29.4</th>
<th>80.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Aggregated By Size</td>
<td>Per 1,000 Poor</td>
<td>Per 1,000 Non-White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Under 10T</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 10 and 25T</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 25 and 50T</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 50 and 100T</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Over 100T</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMSA'S</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>375.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>156.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
check the rent or dwelling unit values which are recorded in D.P.W. Ledgers. As an indication of what might be expected, it can be pointed out that 82.6% of the dwelling units displaced by Federal-Aid Highways during a recent eighteen month period were either valued below $15,000 or rented for less than $110 a month.

The proposed Metropolitan Boston Inner Belt route would displace approximately 1,300 families in Cambridge, and about 2,200 families divided among Jamaica Plain, Milton, and Roxbury, with Roxbury having a very large share of displacees. The heavy displacement will fall in areas which provide low cost housing for lower income families. In Cambridge, for example, 28% of families in census tracts lying across the inner belt route have incomes below $4,000. The median gross rent in the Belt alignment north of Massachusetts Avenue is $76, and the median value of owner occupied structures is $8,900. In the same Cambridge segment of the Inner Belt, almost one-third of the households are elderly.

I do not have the same details on the rest of the alignment, but one can anticipate that the high proportion of Negroes in Roxbury would have particular difficulty securing relocation housing.

From this summary, it should be clear that the kinds of people being displaced by renewal and highway construction for the most part have smaller financial resources, less psychological flexibility, and less freedom of movement than a typical cross-section of the population.

It should also be pointed out that the programs which displace these people have not taken adequate steps to maintain the
supply of low cost units. Highway construction destroys units without replacement. The effect of the urban renewal program on the supply of low income housing has been summarized in the Final Report of the Special Commission on Low-Income Housing.

...the primary impact of the urban renewal program on low-income families to date has been negative rather than positive.

Many low income units are demolished and few are replaced; in the recent history of the Commonwealth's Urban renewal activity:

...14,200 dwelling units, most of which are in the low rent category, are to be demolished...an estimated 4,300 dwelling units have been or are to be constructed, of which only 130 are low-rent public housing. Although the thrust of renewal planning in recent years has been in the direction of minimizing hardships for low-income families, it is still not a program that has been or in the near future will be designed to provide low-rent housing.
II. PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

For households, municipalities, and states, the issues raised by household relocation take on different appearances.

A. Household Issues

The family faced with dislocation must solve housing and sometimes other problems. Housing must be found at rents or prices that can be afforded, and should also be of adequate size, quality, and in a convenient location. In addition, people must overcome other problems that may be associated with dislocation and resettlement.

General Household Issues

There are several situations which can be anticipated. Any given household may fit one or more categories:

1. Well-adjusted families, with adequate resources to use a move as an opportunity to improve its situation. This type of family needs no special assistance and may even have been planning a move. The effect of the relocation project may be to change the timing of this household's move, and perhaps, to increase the difficulty of finding a suitable unit because of a decreased number of dwelling units and an increased number of families searching for units.

2. Families ready to benefit from move, but needing some assistance. This category includes those who were planning moves but face problems due to imposed timing. For example,
a family planning to move may not yet have completed its financial preparations. Also included in this category are households which would benefit from a move but which had not, for some reason, considered moving. With proper assistance people might perceive the advantages of a move and take steps to meet the problems of moving. For this category of family, relocation can be developed into an opportunity.

3. Families with recognized problems that are currently receiving attention. Although these problems are not necessarily related to relocation, the issue for the relocation agency is the assurance of continued service to people during and after relocation.

It is reasonable to assume that people would not choose to move if moving were to hinder solution of problems. If a move is imposed on such people then it is clearly the responsibility of the relocation agency to help assure continued assistance to these people in meeting their problems.

4. Families may be unable to cope with the temporary problems of moving: i.e. searching for a suitable dwelling, packing and transporting goods. It is particularly likely that a high proportion of olderly broken families will be faced with problems of this type.

5. Families may have a particular supportive situation which would be destroyed by a forced move, and not easily duplicated elsewhere.
In the literature describing several residential dislocation projects, there is considerable documentation of many kinds of supportive situations, both informal, and formal, which were difficult to duplicate for the relocatees.

Frequently areas with concentrations of a particular ethnic group or groups, of non-whites, of poor, or of elderly have institutions which perform specialized health, religious educational, social welfare, and recreational services. Where these services are critical to the well-being of the people to be relocated, it is important to ask whether potential reception areas either have substitute facilities, or can plausibly be expected to develop such facilities. I do not think that it is beyond the function of relocation agencies to assess the suitability of reception areas, and, if necessary, offer reception areas assistance to prepare them for relocatees.

In addition to the institutional supports which may be destroyed by a forced move, there are also informal supportive situations which may be disrupted. For the elderly, invalid, or otherwise handicapped, the support may be the presence of understanding friends and neighbors whose assistance permits a more normal life pattern than would be possible if the person were institutionalized. A less obvious supportive situation is the informal arrangement sometimes made between landlords and tenants, and built upon years of goodwill, where rent can be delayed in times
of unemployment or other financial hardship, or where the tenant may even perform services for the landlord in return for reduced rent.

It is seen then, that informal supportive situations can offer social, psychological and even financial security which may be difficult to duplicate in a new neighborhood.

6. A family with one kind of problem is likely to develop other difficulties under the stress of relocation; the existence of one problem often increases the vulnerability of people to other problems. Thus for example it is easy to see that for some relocatees the prospect of losing an important support is so upsetting that it becomes impossible to cope with the temporary problems of searching for a suitable dwelling in a suitable neighborhood, and packing and transporting goods. Or, alternately, it is easy to understand that a family with a recognized problem that is under care may become so anxious about possible interruption of the care that problems it would otherwise cope with become more difficult.

It is not surprising to hear reports of higher death rates among elderly relocatees during, and for a period of three to four months after relocation.\textsuperscript{11}

From case studies in the literature, it is clear that where one type of family problem is discovered, the relocation agency should be prepared to deal with other
ills, disabilities, and difficulties precipitated by actual relocation or the prospect of relocation.

7. Since good relocation planning requires taking stock of a wide range of problems, it is clear that relocation in addition to posing problems, also provides an opportunity for the community to discover and aid those people whose problems were unapparent in the past. Relocation is a time of change, but a time of change properly managed can become an opportunity rather than a disruption.

**Financial Standards for Household Relocation**

Setting financial standards for the rehousing of dislocated families requires careful study.

Any financial standard, I believe, must contain, explicitly or implicitly, a description of the household type, a definition of the housing package, and a corresponding rule concerning allocation. Beyond these three elements which are needed for an operational standard, there is, of course, the requirement that the standard be reasonable. The standard should have a logical relation to articulated policy objectives. One concern of policy should naturally be 'fairness.' In addition, the administrative and data requirements of the standard should not be unreasonable.

The following reviews some empirical studies, and some standards, and suggests additional approaches to setting standards.

In their chapter on the economic behavior of U. S. urban housing consumers, Meyerson, Terrett, and Wheaton indicate factors which correlate with the relative size of the consumer's allocation for housing. These factors are income level, family size, age of head of household, occupation, education, and race.
Using statistics from the 1950 Bureau of Labor Statistics Study of Consumer Expenditures, the authors point out that urban families spent 15.2% of their average income after taxes for housing and utilities. The distribution of per cent allocation by income brackets was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Greater Than 50%</th>
<th>2000-3000</th>
<th>5000-6000</th>
<th>10,000 Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authors' interpretation of the distribution is:

"The principal cause of the high expenditures for housing for low income families is an income level so low that even a minimal outlay for housing absorbs a disproportionately high share of their earnings."

Calculation of the percentage of income after taxes spent on housing and utilities by the 1960-61 SCE sample of families and single consumers in the Boston SMSA shows similar results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Under 1000</th>
<th>2000-3000</th>
<th>5000-6000</th>
<th>10,000 Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent on Housing</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all families in the sample, the average allocation for housing is 18.8% of income after taxes.

It seems likely that low income families in Boston in 1960-61 spend such a high proportion of income on housing for principally the same reason advanced by Meyerson et al for low income urban families in 1950, "a minimal outlay for housing absorbs . . . a high share of earnings."
In middle and low income groups, family size has an inverse relationship with size of allocation for housing, according to the study of Meyerson et al. Holding income level constant at 4,000 to 5,000, in the 1950 BLS SCE, the amount spent on housing and utilities decreases as family size increases:

\[ \text{TABLE 7} \]

**For Income Level of 4 to 5 Thousand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Persons in Family</th>
<th>% on Housing and Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author's conclusion is that the pressure of providing necessities for more people causes the family to spend less on housing.

Older households seem to 'over-spend' on housing relative to family size and income. An adaptation of Table 1 p. 59 of Meyerson et al illustrates:

\[ \text{TABLE 8} \]

**Housing Cost as Per Cent of Income Before Taxes by Age of Household Head, U. S. Urban Families, 1950.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75 plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% on Person</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Per Person</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this data is old, there is reason to believe that the same pattern persists. One suspects that it is hard for older
families to move to smaller quarters partly because mortgages are hard to arrange, and partly because they are used to the place and find it hard to "move down."

White collar workers tend to spend a greater per cent of income on housing than blue collar workers, and probably related to this, there was a positive correlation between educational level and per cent of income spent on housing.

Negro families of a given size and income level tended to spend less on housing than corresponding white families.

These BLS figures must be interpreted with care. It should be borne in mind that the data is for 1950, and that the quality of the housing and associated services paid for was not specified.

For example not only did poorer families pay a greater percentage of their income for housing, but using the 1960 Housing Census of Massachusetts as a guide, there is a higher incidence of poorer families in substandard housing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Family Income</th>
<th>Per Cent of All Households in State Living in Substandard Housing</th>
<th>Per Cent of All Households in Income Bracket in Substandard Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 4,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 5,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations above suggest to me that further empirical
studies, and the eventual setting of standards should proceed using fine categories; that is, the Cartesian product of income level, family size, age of head of household, occupation and/or education, race, and, where possible, housing standards. For convenience, categories should be combined as continued study indicates that this is appropriate.

It is worth looking at some present standards to see what strengths and weaknesses they have.

In early Public Housing Laws, there was sometimes mention that income of families in projects shall not exceed five times the rent charged. From the wording, it would appear that this rule was used to help determine income levels eligible for public housing, given permissible rents. Current public housing laws have dropped this phrase, but local administrators seem to use it as a rule of thumb. In Cambridge, for example, rents are determined at roughly one fifth of income for families with children (not scaled to family size), and at roughly one third of income for families without children.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964 relocation adjustment payments are set as the difference between the amount necessary to secure appropriate housing and 20% of income.

Although these standards may have been developed from empirical studies, and clearly related to some policy objectives, the procedures followed and the line of reasoning, if ever explicit, have been lost, or at least not publicized.

If the line of reasoning is obscure, these standards do have
other virtues: they deal with a broad range of households, and they are easy to apply.

By contrast the Bureau of Labor Statistics' City Worker Family Budget (CWFB), and the Budget for a Retired Couple are developed by a very explicit empirical process, but are limited in applicability to the family type defined.

The CWFB family has four people, a husband, wife, and two children. There is only one wage earner. They rent their dwelling.

The budget is developed in the following manner: items like food and beverages, and medical care, are based on biological or statistical standards. The Department of Agriculture prepares an adequate diet, which is costed in different cities. Medical expenses are derived using insurance data.

The quantities of other consumers' goods comprising the budget are set using the quantity-income elasticity of budget type families. That is, the budget quantity is set at the point where budget families stop spending increasing proportions of income increments on an item. These quantities are costed in different cities.

The shelter cost is based on a five-room house, meeting APHA standards, and including power to operate the equipment provided in the budget, within ten blocks of public transport, and in a neighborhood with a play area for children. Housing with rooms over standard size, or with more than one bathroom, or with other specified luxury features are excluded from consideration.

The cost of housing which meets the standard is determined by sampling units which meet the specifications.
The total cost of the 1959 budget in Boston, determined in this way, is 6,317 dollars, including taxes and other costs. Rent, heat and utilities cost $1,240 a year, or approximately $103 per month; this amounts to 19.7% of income before tax and 23.3% of income after tax. This is the housing allocation in a budget that is termed "modest but adequate" for a four-person family in Boston.

It is interesting to compare the CWFB allocation with the data from the 1960 Census of Housing for the Boston SMSA. Families in the 6,000 to 6,999 census income group spent a median of $89 for gross rent. The CWFB figure is $14 a month above this median. But the families in this census income group do not all live in housing which meets the CWFB standard. In fact, at least 17% of the families live in housing which does not meet the CWFB standard. Probably greater than 17% of the families live in housing which does not meet CWFB standards. For one thing the census does not include the locational criteria: that a dwelling must be within a certain distance of public transport and a play area. In addition, the census income category includes families of different sizes; thus, although 20.6% of these renters (7,039 families) pay more than 20% of income for rent, it is also true that 7,266 of these families have five or more persons.

Unfortunately, one cannot isolate the CWFB family in the Census of Housing, but I think it has been shown, working with the available categories, that the CWFB standard is plausible and seems consistent with census data.

The Budget for a Retired Couple in Boston is developed with
a shelter cost based on a rented two or three room dwelling, which meets APHA standards, which is near (within 10 blocks) public transport and an outdoor sitting space, which is not near a hazard or nuisance, and which excludes units above the standard in size of rooms, number of bathrooms, or in 'luxury service.' Included is the cost of heat, utilities and refrigeration.

The total cost of goods and services of the Retired Couple Budget in Boston is 3,304. Housing costs $1,029, or approximately $86 per month gross rent; this amounts to approximately 31% of the total cost of goods and services. The Budget for a Retired Couple does not give an estimate of budget income before taxes. If this is estimated by interpolating in Table I A of the Bureau of Labor Statistics 1960-61 Study of Consumer Expenditure for Boston, then housing cost can be estimated at about 28.7% of income before taxes.

This percentage seems rather high, and is probably an over-estimate of the housing costs of the elderly because the housing cost is estimated by sampling appropriate units including newly constructed units, whereas the elderly are likely to be in older structures, with lower rents.

The BLS Budget Estimates would seem to be fair guidelines to use for relocating families who fit the family definitions, particularly since the costs estimated are for established families in the city and are not indicators of what it would cost a household to settle in the city. The principle I would apply here is that since relocatees have no choice but to move, their expenses should be no greater than the average costs of similar families already
established in the city. The costs for relocatees should clearly not be as high as for families voluntarily settling in the city.

The principal difficulty in employing the BLS budgets is the particularity with which they apply. The financial standard must be capable of covering all family types. One possibility would be to develop additional BLS budgets to cover other family types. But this does not resolve the problem of how to deal with families who fit a BLS definition but earn less than the modest but adequate income. Should the same percentage rule be applied in their case? Shouldn't they be paying a smaller percentage of their income for rent if they are poorer -- so that there will be adequate resources for other necessities? Ideally yes, and in fact relocation could be used as an opportunity to improve the income level and the allocation of poorer families. But the total cost of the welfare program should not be written in as a cost of the displacing project in cost-benefit analysis. There should be some method for allocating costs of relocation between those which should be assigned to the displacing project, and those which should be assigned to welfare projects taken on over and above what is necessary to cope with the effects of the displacement.

Another approach to the setting of standards grows from the assumption that most families have probably done as well as they could in allocating their resources, given the limitations of their situations. The appropriate relocation financial standard in this situation should be not a percentage of income, but should be a statement of allowable change in percentage of income allocated to housing.
The following empirical procedure could be used to establish allowable deviation: Households would be classified into categories produced by taking the Cartesian product of levels of income, family size, age, occupation, education, and race. Movement of these households within the metropolitan area would be studied by sample survey. For each household the size and frequency of changes in housing expenditure and whether the change was associated with a move would be recorded. In addition the attitude toward the change would be systematically probed and assigned a score.

For relocatees, the allowable changes in expenditure for housing could be bounded by choosing an affect score which would be deemed 'unacceptable.' The 'unacceptable' affect score would be associated with a size of change, perhaps different for different family types, and this size change would become the 'unacceptable' financial change.

The cost of relocation services plus the costs of remaining within "allowable" change should be assigned to the displacing project in cost-benefit analysis. Additional costs of welfare projects not related to relocation should not be assigned to the displacing project.

A source of data which may be adaptable to standard setting is the Bureau of Labor Statistics Survey of Retail Prices of Shelter Rents, conducted as part of the work on the Consumer Price Index. Visits are paid twice a year to each dwelling in the sample, and changes in unit, rent, or services included in rent are recorded. Changes in occupancy of the unit are also recorded. The unit and the structure are described in some detail: for the unit, the number of
rooms, type of bathroom facility, refrigeration, cooking fuel, heating equipment, garage, and condition is recorded; for the structure, the type, the number of units in the structure, and the year built is recorded. Data on the tenant includes number of persons and race.

This BLS survey is particularly valuable because it enables one to distinguish between inflationary rise in rents and an increase in value of the goods and services included in rent.

Although details have not been worked out, it would seem useful to utilize the BLS with its experience and impartiality to gather data to set financial standards for rehousing relocatees, and standards for administration of different government subsidy programs.

B. Municipality Issues

Family relocation, particularly in larger projects, may have a direct effect on the quality of a community. Who will be living where as a result of relocation? What will be the effect of this change in household distribution on the provision of educational, health and other social services? What long run changes are being wrought on the residential environment?

A related issue, and one in which municipalities will take a keen interest, is the effect of the relocation and its corresponding project on municipal revenues and costs.

The municipality must consider the social and economic effects of the dislocation on the households directly involved and also the effects on the welfare of the entire community.
C. State Issues

For the state, household relocation raises a basic policy issue: what is the order of priorities among different objectives pursued by government? There are at least two types of conflicts raised by household dislocation and its effect on housing supply.

First there is direct conflict between housing policy and programs which reduce the supply of low-income housing. The extensive public works program in Massachusetts will displace about 10,000 families in the next two years. Most of these projects (notably highway construction) destroy, with no provision for replacement, a higher proportion of low rent units than would be expected on a random basis. Such projects conflict with solution of the low income housing problem in the state.

Another form of conflict involves different agencies sponsoring concurrent projects, both of which claim the same housing resources to meet their relocation needs. Conversations with agency officials suggest that agencies are reluctant to meet this issue directly; the strategy generally followed is to ignore the magnitude of the rehousing problem in public statements while privately striving to get the project on the ground ahead of the competition.

Appropriate procedures for dealing with these two forms of conflict have not yet been developed. Clearly this is a responsibility that goes beyond the Bureau of Relocation. It is probably the Governor who must devise a reasonable means for working out compromises between conflicting policies. The Bureau of Relocation can assist the Governor by requiring clear and uniform identification of the relocation costs and benefits associated with alternate projects.
III. CURRENT RELOCATION PRACTICE

A. The Legal Basis of Relocation Planning

With federally-aided projects accounting for almost all of household displacement in Massachusetts over the last two years it is apparent that Federal as well as state laws and policies must be reviewed for their impact on relocation practice in the Commonwealth.

The Federal and state governments have become more concerned with the costs, economic and otherwise, borne by the people and businesses displaced by eminent domain. Realizing the inadequacy of "just compensation" to cope with the problems of both owners and tenants, legislators have acted to establish laws and policies providing additional assistance, monetary and otherwise, to the displacees. However, legislative reform was not applied uniformly to provide relocation assistance and financial benefits to everyone displaced by eminent domain; the reform was developed in a fragmentary fashion within the legislative programs for particular displacing activities. The result is that, today, the treatment accorded to those displaced by eminent domain depends on what type of project is planned, whether road, or urban renewal, or public building.

To understand present practice it will be necessary to trace, briefly, relocation policy for different types of public projects.

1. Federal Laws and Policies

   Urban Renewal

   After World War II a great deal of postponed construction and
redevelopment began. In 1949 Federally assisted urban renewal was established by Title I of the Housing Act.

The 1949 Housing Act was concerned with the clearance of slums. Although an agency was required to have a feasible plan for relocation the emphasis was on getting people off the site rather than assisting them. In practice, the total cost of relocation assistance turned out to be less than the cost of delays and evictions.

The 1954 Housing Act shifted emphasis from individual slum clearance projects to "workable programs" for combating decay. Where feasible, structures were to be rehabilitated rather than cleared, reducing the problems of relocation. In addition, the workable program required a plan to help families but not individuals find standard housing within their means. This plan required the approval of the H.H.F.A. administrator.

Moving costs were first provided on a regular basis by the Housing Act of 1956. The statutory maximum allowable payment per family now stands at $200.00.

Three important advances in relocation are made by the 1964 Housing Act. First, the requirement that there be a feasible method of relocation is extended to include individuals as well as families. Second, the H.H.F.A. is required to issue regulations covering the establishment and operation of a relocation assistance program. A relocation assistance program must determine the needs of displacees for assistance, and provide assistance to minimize the hardship of displacement. Third, relocation adjustment payments up to 500 dollars are authorized for families and elderly individuals (62 and older)
who must pay more than 20% of their incomes to find standard housing. (The payment is for amounts of rent in excess of 20% of income and is for one year only.)

H.H.F.A., in Section 16 of the Urban Renewal Manual, describes the objectives and requirements of relocation planning:

(1) Families and individuals displaced by a Title I project shall have the full opportunity of occupying housing that is decent, safe, and sanitary, that is within their financial means, and that is in reasonably convenient locations.

(2) Displacement shall be carried out with a minimum of hardship to site occupants.

In the survey and planning application the L.P.A. is required to submit estimates of the number of site occupants in the project area and number of families to be displaced, and a narrative description of the housing supply in the locality.

The application for loan and grant must contain a relocation report which covers administrative organization and staffing of relocation agency, relocation standards (including physical standards, standards for ability to pay, and location standards), proposals for obtaining relocation housing, description of methods of relocation advisory assistance, and description of method of paying moving costs. Periodic progress reports are also required of the L.P.A.

In sum, the relocation program under urban renewal provides for payment to households of up to $200 for moving expenses (including losses of personal property) plus a relocation adjustment payment up to $500 for low and moderate income families and elderly individuals. H.H.F.A. has regulations which are designed to assure
that relocation assistance programs provide decent, safe and sanitary housing within the means of occupants, in reasonably convenient locations, and minimize the hardships of displacement. As discussed later, these regulations and their enforcement are, in practice, inadequate.

Public Housing

Public housing has the same moving cost and relocation adjustment payment provisions as urban renewal. The requirements assuring availability of standard housing are also the same as for urban renewal. There is no counter-part of the HHFA regulations requiring relocation assistance.

Federally Aided Highways

The 200 dollar limit per household is applied strictly to moving expenses and does not include provision for losses on personal property. The federal legislation says:  

However, the Secretary shall not require a state to pay relocation payments where not authorized by state law.

Massachusetts law requires payment for reasonable and necessary moving expenses, and establishes the same maximum payment as the federal legislation.

The Secretary of Commerce requires that relocation advisory assistance be provided for families, but there is no requirement that there be adequate relocation housing.

Mass Transit

The 200 dollar moving cost limit includes payment for losses on personal property. There is no requirement for relocation assist-
ance, but there is a requirement similar to urban renewal's that there be standard relocation housing available for families, but not for individuals.

Against this background of inconsistent policy, it is not surprising that hearings were held, in June and July of 1965, by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations (of the Committee of Government Operations, United States Senate) on two bills to establish uniform relocation practice. 19

2. State Laws and Policies

Urban Renewal

The Commonwealth participates in urban renewal by providing half of the local share of project costs. The first mention of state responsibility in relocation is found in the General Laws of the Commonwealth, Chapter 121, sections 26J, and 26KK (both from St. 1946, c.574, section 1). The first of these two sections defines "land assembly and redevelopment plan." One of the requirements of the redevelopment plan is that:

"...the plan shall be sufficient to indicate method for the relocation of persons living in the area, if it is to be cleared, and availability of and the means by which there will be provided dwelling units for such persons substantially equal in number to the number of dwelling units cleared from such area."

Section 26KK provides that a land assembly and redevelopment project must be submitted to the local housing board and planning board for approval. If there was no planning board in the town or city, then the Department of Commerce reviewed the project.
The two reviewing bodies must concur in their approval of the project. Grounds for not approving a land assembly and redevelopment project are listed in section 26KK, but it is not explicitly stated that approval can be denied because of inadequate relocation, although perhaps this might have been covered by some aspect of "conformance with the comprehensive plan."

The requirement for relocation is quite crude: dwelling units available must be "substantially equal" to dwelling units cleared. No mention is made of rent levels, location, or general suitability of the dwelling units available for the persons displaced. It is not surprising that no plan failed to receive approval under this law.

A State Uniform Relocation Practices Statute

The next major proposal for expansion of state responsibility in relocation appears in Appendix 14 to the Final Report of the Special Commission on Low-income Housing submitted in April 1965. The Commission outlines its concern:

The housing problems of low-income families are complicated by the extensive public works programs under-way all over the state, which result in the displacement of thousands of families for highways, urban renewal, and other projects. Many of these programs (highway construction, in particular) tend to reduce the total supply of housing, especially of low-rent housing. P. 14.

The appendix proposes the establishment of a Bureau of Relocation within the Department of Commerce and Development, and describes its functions.

The taking agencies, in particular the Department of Public
Works, felt that a Bureau of Relocation with powers suggested by Appendix 14 would threaten their programs. Governor Volpe directed the contending parties to meet and produce a compromise which they could both live with. The result of those meetings, known as Chapter 790 of the Acts of 1965 was approved by Governor Volpe as an emergency law in December 1965. Like Appendix 14, this law establishes a Bureau of Relocation in the Department of Commerce and Development and provides for relocation assistance to persons and organizations displaced by eminent domain.

To bring out the areas of compromise in Chapter 790 of the acts of 1965, portions of this Bill will be contrasted with Appendix 14, the stronger legislation recommended by the Special Commission on Low-income Housing.

In broad outline the two bills are similar. Both establish a Bureau of Relocation within the Department of Commerce and Development, and specify conditions under which a relocation plan, with specified contents, is to be submitted for Bureau approval. Further, both provide for continued review of an agency's relocation performance to insure that it is in conformance with the approved relocation plan.

In two provisions, Chapter 79A seems more liberal than Appendix 14. 'Displaced occupant' is explicitly broadened to include occupants caused to move by the imminence of acquisition, so that some of those who move prior to the actual taking are eligible for relocation assistance. In Chapter 79A the level of displacement, requiring submission of a relocation plan is dropped to six dwelling
units from ten.

In other important respects, Chapter 79A is a much weaker law than Appendix 14. In the first place, the powers of the Bureau of Relocation are explicitly reduced; second, the wording of the compromise law is so unclear in some critical sections that it may produce some court tests if the Bureau tries to exercise some powers.

The most substantial reduction of the Bureau's powers concerns review of the relocation plan. (Section 5, 79A) If the cost of relocation is paid in part or whole by the Federal government and the relocation plan of a taking agency is required to be examined and reviewed by a federal agency or department or to comply with the requirements of an agency or department, then the Bureau of Relocation cannot review that portion of the relocation plan governed by Federal regulations. The Bureau can review only that aspect of the relocation plan which is required by the Bureau and exceeds the Federal requirements.

The weakness of this section is that Federal agencies are sometimes not concerned with or not in a position to judge the adequacy of relocation plans and are likely to approve relocation plans with little or no serious consideration. In fact, the exclusive 'or' above would seem to indicate that the Bureau cannot even question whether the federal agency has seriously considered the relocation plan or not; all that is necessary to prohibit Bureau review of an aspect of a relocation plan is that the taking agency is required to comply on that aspect with the requirements of an agency or department of the federal government.
The Bureau is effectively prohibited by Section 5 from reviewing the more significant elements of the relocation plans of the most significant displacement projects likely to occur in the state.

Limited review and power to stop displacement is granted to the Bureau under Sections 9 and 10 Chapter 79A. It is these two poorly worded sections which may bring the Bureau to court:

Section 9. If the bureau determines that a taking agency or relocation agency is proceeding with a project in disregard of a relocation plan approved under section five, and that relocation assistance being given is inadequate, the bureau shall so notify the relocation agency and the taking agency in writing, and may suspend its approval of the plan. Upon receipt of written notice of such suspension, the taking agency shall not further displace occupants until the bureau notifies it in writing that such suspension is withdrawn. Written notice of suspension shall be sent by registered mail, and shall state the specific reasons for such suspension.

Section 10. If a relocation plan required by section four is disapproved under section five, or approval is suspended under section nine, because the bureau determines that adequate relocation housing is not available, the taking agency may file with the bureau its certificate that the project involved is an emergency project which must be carried out in spite of the unavailability of such housing. If the bureau, after considering the foregoing and such other evidence as is deemed pertinent, determines that the project involved is an emergency project and that the public interest demands the displacement of occupants even though adequate relocation housing may be unavailable, emergency approval may be given, provided the relocation plan is satisfactory to the bureau in other respects.

In Section 9 the condition for suspending approval of a relocation plan is a compound one. The taking agency or relocation agency must be proceeding in disregard of a relocation plan, and the relocation assistance being given must be inadequate. (Relocation assistance is defined as including advisory assistance, and monetary
The conditions above do not cover the situation where an approved relocation plan may be outdated due to unforeseen reduction in the available housing supply. According to the above, as long as the agency is adhering to the originally approved relocation plan, then there is no grounds for the bureau to suspend approval of the plan and displacement of occupants.

The first sentence of Section 10 directly contradicts Section 9's conditions for suspension of approval:

... or approval is suspended under Section 9, because the bureau determines that adequate relocation housing is not available...

The sentence implies that the Bureau can, in fact, suspend approval of a relocation plan if it determines at any time that adequate relocation housing is not available.

It is not surprising that there is controversy among lawyers about the meaning of sections nine and ten. Among lawyers sympathetic to the purposes of the Bureau of Relocation there is consensus that the Bureau should assume the stronger powers, and if necessary have the issue resolved in court.

Appendix 14 is by contrast quite explicit in providing that the Bureau can at any time find the housing supply inadequate and suspend displacement.

In both Bills there is provision for carrying out displacement even if there is inadequate housing, providing either (1) that a determination is made that the project involved is an emergency project, or, (2) suspension of approval would cause loss of federal funds for the project. Of course, the relocation plan must be
acceptable in other, easily remedied respects.

In 79A, the power of determining whether a project is an emergency project is given to the Bureau. In Appendix 14 the power of determination is given to the Governor for state agency projects, and to the mayor in the case of municipal projects. It is difficult to know the practical difference which this shift in review power will make.

Another provision of Chapter 79A requires that moving costs be paid to relocatees by all agencies public or private displacing by eminent domain. Procedures for payment require that occupants receive no later than the day before the move either a minimum payment of twenty-five dollars, or a certificate which the mover can redeem to cover reasonable and necessary costs. There is also provision for the relocatee to file for additional amounts. Some agencies, particularly the renewal agencies, public housing, and the Department of Public Works, have been following such procedures in compliance with Federal regulations. The significance of this section is that it provides for uniform administration of moving costs to displacees regardless of the type of displacing activity.

Section II of Chapter 79A states that the costs of preparing relocation plans and carrying out relocation are to be considered part of the costs of acquiring the property, establishing a uniformity which did not exist before.

Section 5 and 6 of Chapter 790 of the Acts of 1965 have helped generate considerable confusion about when the Bureau of Relocation assumes its powers:
Section 5. Chapter seventy-nine A of the General Laws, inserted by section four of this act, shall apply only with respect to properties taken or acquired on or after March first, nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

Section 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of section two of chapter seventy-nine A of the General Laws, inserted by section four of this act, in any case where the costs of relocation assistance of a taking agency are reimbursed in whole or in part by the federal government and the said taking agency has been approved by the federal government to be qualified to perform relocation assistance, then until July first, nineteen hundred and sixty-seven that taking agency shall be deemed to be a qualified relocation agency for the purposes of said chapter and shall not during such period be disqualified by the bureau of relocation.

The Bureau has three levels of review powers. One is to qualify an agency to perform relocation; another is to approve the relocation plan itself; and the third is to monitor the performance of the relocation agency, and suspend plan approval. Section 6 above, is referring only to the first of the Bureau's powers. Accordingly, I think that the Bureau now (May 1966) has the power to review all relocation plans in accordance with Section 5, Chapter 79A and to monitor performance and to suspend approval of any relocation plan in accordance with Sections 9 and 10, Chapter 79A. I think that it is incorrect to regard the Bureau's job as beginning legally on July 1, 1967. The limitation of Section 6 of Chapter 790 seems to apply only to the qualification of an agency to perform relocation. An agency which has been qualified is still subject to disapproval and suspension of its relocation plan by the Bureau of Relocation.

It is important to note that there are no requirements in this law for payment of moving costs, or other financial or relocation assistance in the case of police power takings, notably those due to code enforcement.
B. Policies, Procedures, and Attitudes of Relocation Agencies

Urban Renewal Agencies

Urban renewal agencies will almost invariably express a public ideology that conforms with the objectives of relocation as stated in the Manual:

(1) Families and individuals displaced by a Title I project shall have the full opportunity of occupying housing that is decent, safe, and sanitary, that is within their financial means, and that is in reasonably convenient locations.

(2) Displacement shall be carried out with a minimum of hardship to site occupants.

It is the job of the investigator to discover the private feelings that the relocation staff holds about the job. The private feelings that directors hold about the importance of proper relocation affects the order of priorities under conditions of conflict. For the relocation worker, the private conception of the job will spill over into personal relations with relocatees and affect the development of rapport, so often essential to good relocation assistance.

In conversation, directors of renewal and relocation produced remarks ranging from those which showed a general cognizance of HUD relocation standards, to more emotional utterances such as, "it's heartbreaking to see a family move into sub-standard housing." There seems to be no particular correlation between the intensity of utterances and the true concern for proper relocation. True feelings are revealed by priorities displayed when a choice must be made between two or more courses of action, or policies, or sets of standards.
Income Standards

On a few occasions I have participated in discussions on what per cent of income a household could reasonably allocate to rent. Renewal people argued that the 25% standard is one that is accepted generally, and that it ought to be used for relocation. It was answered that it is not justifiable to apply to all households a standard that is only reasonable for some. For large families, and poor households, it is easily shown that a 25% allocation of income for rent may leave resources too small to deal with other necessities.21

On two occasions different responses were given by a respected redevelopment authority. Once it was claimed that it is a myth that relocation involves a disproportionate number of poor. This is absurd as has been shown earlier. On the other occasion it was said that adoption of a 20% standard would make relocation an impossible task; that there simply wasn't enough low cost housing to meet the needs of relocatees. Although it was proposed that a 20% standard be accepted for special cases, and a 25% standard for all other cases, the agencies would not accept these terms.

Application of the 25% standard to households which cannot, in fact, afford to allocate this much for housing has a number of effects. First, use of this standard may understate the shortage of units for low income households. Second, households relocated in accordance with this standard may be made to bear the burdens of a rent bill too great for a small budget. Indirectly the application of the 25% standard, because it understates the low income housing problem, may delay the passage of legislative remedies.
The choice made in this instance reveals the priorities of more than a few renewal agencies. Concern with adequacy of the housing supply, particularly low income housing supply, is of secondary importance to getting the project on the ground. More important, the shortage of housing is usually seen as an obstacle to renewal policy rather than as an object of policy.

**Vacancy Rates and Turn-over Rates**

Frequently renewal agencies choose to obscure rather than document the housing shortage.

This behavior is illustrated by the improper use of turn-over rates in describing adequacy of relocation housing supply.

It will be useful to digress momentarily and clarify what is meant by "vacancy rate" and "turn-over rate."

Vacancy rate is the ratio of unoccupied to total dwelling units at a given point in time. Vacancy rate is an expression of the amount of slack in a housing market at a given instant; it compares the number of households with the number of dwelling units. If it is ever anticipated that the number of households in an area will exceed the number of dwellings, then it is clear that an "excess" household must either search in other housing markets for a unit, or if it insists on remaining in the same market, it must inevitably "double-up" with a household that already occupies a unit.

Turn-over rate is measured over a time interval. It is a count over a specified time period of the number of dwelling units which become available for occupancy. A unit may become available as a result of construction, or rehabilitation of a unit previously unfit for habitation, or obviously, as a result of a household moving out.
Knowledge of only the turn-over rate of a housing market does not enable one to infer the vacancy rate.

Continuing abstractly, the turn-over rate tells us the number of choices available to a household over a period of time, but it tells us nothing of the likelihood of a household actually securing a dwelling. Assuming all households are equal in their competition for available units, the likelihood that a given household secures a given available unit is one divided by the number of competing households. Over a period of time the probability that a household will secure some dwelling is equal to the sum of the probabilities applying to the individual units available over that time. If there are not enough dwelling units for the households, then it does not matter how high the turn-over rate is, the probability that a given household secures a unit will be less than one; one or more households will not be housed.

Since this point is so simple as to be obvious, I can only conclude that those who do not understand the logic do not wish to. It would complicate the implementation of their program responsibilities, as they conceive them, if they were to include the vacancy rate in their relocation plans. Honest documentation of the vacancy rate would undoubtedly expose relocation housing shortages which are currently hidden behind specious argument based on the turnover rate.

Co-ordination or Competition?

A third kind of situation illustrates further that when proper relocation conflicts with expediting a project, proper relocation is sacrificed. In one community two urban renewal projects had
been suspended because of proposed highway construction. The purpose of the suspension of the renewal projects was to delay them so that they could be co-ordinated with the highway project. I was told by a redevelopment authority that shortly after taking office, President Kennedy asked for a speed-up of renewal projects. One consequence of his request, they said, is that URA lifted the suspension of one of the renewal projects, in spite of the fact that the highway construction, to qualify for Interstate funding, would coincidentally be displacing households at the same time as the renewal project. The potential conflict between the relocation activities of these two projects has been ignored by the renewal agency. Its relocation planning takes no account of the highway dislocation.

Although the details of this case are exceptional, I do not think that the practice it illustrates is unusual. There are other cases where conflicting projects in the same or neighboring jurisdictions are not taken into account in relocation planning.

In some agencies with strong relocation staffs, it was felt by relocation workers that agency policy conflicted with proper relocation, "They don't really care about relocation, they just want to get the project on the ground." The documentation of agency behavior under conditions of conflict suggests that there may be some justification in the relocation staff's contention that their own agency is not very sympathetic with the requirements of good relocation. On the basis of my observation, I would soften this somewhat by pointing out that agencies seem quite willing to provide assistance and remedy relocation problems when the project timetable
would not be disrupted. But when faced with the most serious relocation problem, the shortage of housing, agencies are often not willing to stretch their project timetables to permit construction of relocation housing. The relocation staffs seem at least partly justified in their indictment of agency policy.

In the smaller agencies, with newly developing relocation staffs, it was felt that the chief obstacle to good performance was lack of knowledge about relocation work. It was said that people wanted to do a good job, but often didn't know how to go about finding out how to do a good job. In this connection there was strong feeling that the Bureau of Relocation could be helpful by arranging an informal conference to exchange ideas about relocation, and by developing a manual on relocation planning that goes beyond section 16 of the Urban Renewal Manual.

Other Taking Agencies

The remaining taking agencies, of which the Department of Public Works is most active, have a much simpler view of relocation responsibilities than the renewal agencies. They carry their attitudes from the period before Chapter 790.

When I told one relocation official at D.P.W. that I was writing my thesis on relocation, he said, "What can you write about relocation?" For him "relocation program" was synonymous with "payment of moving costs" and "clearing and managing the site." With discussions currently underway at the Bureau of Relocation, the Department of Public Works seems to be developing some idea of the elements of good relocation programs. The D.P.W. does not seem adverse
to spending money for relocation planning where it feels that it is empowered to spend federal money for the purpose.

The principal source of D.P.W.'s reluctance to go along with proper relocation planning is the length of time considered necessary by relocation planners to develop relocation staff, and program. Where relocation housing must be constructed, an additional time lag is faced. The reluctance of D.P.W. to delay construction is traced to the requirements of the Interstate Defense Highway Program for disbursal of funds. Clearance for the road must be completed by January 1968 to qualify for funds, unless, of course, Congress extends the deadline.

An important recommendation for the immediate relief of the crises in relocation programming is that Congress extend the deadline for disbursement of Interstate funds.

C. Analysis of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire on residential dislocation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was developed to assist in the formulation of a program for the Bureau of Relocation, in the Division of Urban Renewal of the Department of Commerce. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

The short answer responses document the size of past and anticipated activity, the characteristics of the households displaced, the characteristics of relocation agency staffing and performance, and whether the families were reached and helped by agency assistance. In addition, the questionnaire records the reactions of agencies to different
forms of State assistance for relocation planning.

Questions were generated by reading the literature describing and evaluating relocation programs, and by interviewing concerned people. After several weeks and many revisions, the questionnaire was pretested: the Executive Directors of two Redevelopment Authorities reviewed the questionnaire while I was present.

The questionnaires were reproduced and mailed out to 69 taking agencies and to over 200 planning boards. The covering letter to the planning boards contained special instructions which asked that they first estimate the displacement in their town for certain years, and then forward the questionnaire, for more detailed answers, to the government office which had most recently completed a relocation project.

A recovery campaign of two months was marked by phone calls and letters.

**Processing of Data**

Returned questionnaires were edited for computer processing. Where answers were omitted, it was sometimes not clear whether the question was considered unanswerable or whether the value of the answer was zero. Throughout editing, zero was assigned to unanswered questions, with the exception of question eight, where no answer was interpreted as "No opinion" and a value of four was assigned.

Essays were considered separately.

The coded values of the short answer questions were transcribed to edit sheets which contained other information. A copy of the edit sheet is included in Appendix B. If the town or city belonged to an SMSA, an appropriate code number was recorded. Also recorded was 1960 census data on population, number of households, and,
where available, the percentage of poor, elderly, and non-white households in the town.

The information on the edit sheets was then punched onto data cards. Each questionnaire required nine cards for data storage.

**Programming**

The programming has been performed in two stages. The preliminary processing of the questionnaire calculated the values of the variables, produced tabulations and performed a few tests. The cross tabulations, and other data were printed out. The output variable values will be punched onto data cards, and these read into storage for further manipulation on the time sharing system.

**The Background Run**

A test is performed on each questionnaire to check the internal consistency of responses about income and rent.

The background run also produced tables representing different slices through the data. Where feasible, data was grouped by cause of displacement, population of town, and SMSA. The tabulations document displacement of households by years, per cent of households eligible for assistance, per cent of eligible households who received moving costs in 1965, types of households assisted (whether one-person, roomers, and boarders), size of relocation agency staff, and whether they have performed relocation services for another agency, the estimated incidence of poor, elderly, and non-white households among displacees, the estimated number per 1,000 of poor and non-white families who have been dislocated in 1964-65, the estimated agency
workload for 1965 through 1967, the cost of the workload, and the cost per household of the workload.

The needs of dislocated families were documented by data taken on before relocation conditions: the number of poor, elderly, non-white, and the number of families on welfare, the number of families overcrowded or in sub-standard housing, the estimated per cent of poor families paying greater than 20% of income for rent, and the percent of all families paying greater than 20% and greater than 25% of income for rent.

The procedures of agencies were documented by the number offering the following relocation services: short-term counseling, referral to social welfare, follow-up to see if referral is taken, medical assistance, relocation adjustment payment, or other rent assistance, home-making courses, or other additional services.

Procedures of agencies were further documented by number of staff members and their experience, the cost per household of their most recent project, the lapse of time between survey and taking, the percent of households who moved off the property between survey and taking, the number of agencies who did advanced surveys, and who changed the design or timing of the project as a result of the survey, and the number of agencies collecting data about race, income, and feelings of relocated families about the move.

The performance of the agency in reaching families was documented by the percent of eligible families who received moving costs, the proportion of poor families who received some form of rent assistance, the percent of families who were agency referred and the
percent self-relocated. For those who were self-relocated, the percent of dwellings inspected, and the percent of "lost" households was recorded.

Changes in family welfare were documented by the percent living in crowded and sub-standard units both before and after relocation, by the median gross rents paid before, and after relocation, and by the median percent of income spent on rent before and after relocation. The success of the agency in keeping rent expenditure down is indicated by a comparison of the median rents paid by self-relocated families and agency-relocated families not in public housing.

Time Sharing

On time sharing, the variables which document household need, agency procedures, and whether the households were reached and helped, will be treated in two ways.

First, correlations will be run between pairs of variables as a simple descriptive device. For example, is there a correlation between workload per relocation worker and the proportion of households agency referred? Does this correlation disappear when workload is controlled for income level? This kind of situation, where further correlation tests are suggested as work progresses, is very suitable for time sharing.

Second, another form of correlation will be employed. The variables documenting family need will be combined and the scores sorted into quintiles. Variables documenting agency procedures, and whether families were reached and helped will also be combined and agencies sorted into quintiles. These dimensions -- need, procedure, reaching, helping -- will then be combined in pairs and triplets to
form the axis of two or three dimensional arrays. Analysis of the arrays will indicate which agencies need to give attention to their procedures, and which agencies face obstacles to good performance which do not seem related to the procedures studied.

These two forms of analysis combined with the evaluation of the essay questions and interviews will form part of the documentary basis supporting recommendations for relocation planning.

**ESSAYS**

From an analysis of the essay answers in the questionnaire four major areas of concern are indicated. These are

1. Housing supply.

2. Community involvement and relations; including the problem of discrimination.

3. Social Service issues.

4. Staff issues.

1. Housing Supply

Three essay questions were directed to housing issues:

2.2 How do you determine in advance whether there is adequate public and private housing for relocation?

2.3 Have you ever found the housing supply inadequate in condition, rent, location, or suitability for relocatees? If so, what kinds of steps were taken to correct this?

6.15 What standards does agency use to determine whether housing is standard or not?

a. Determining Demand and Supply in Advance: Public Housing

The supply of public housing is generally determined
by written inquiry to the local public housing authority. The quality of the inquiries and commitments varies considerably. From reading letters on file in the Part I Applications it is clear that some housing authorities indicate that the turnover rate and expected new units seem adequate to handle relocatees without explicitly guaranteeing priority treatment to relocatees applying for public housing. When asked to mention two or three aspects of relocation which need attention, the Brockton Redevelopment Authority wrote that local housing authorities should be encouraged to fulfill commitments in accepting relocatees from urban renewal areas.

In a letter to the Worcester Redevelopment Authority, the local housing authority indicates that a certain number of units will probably be available to relocatees. But it is not clear to me whether "available" means that relocatees will be given preference, or that the units will be open for allocation among all applicants.

In addition to the confusion surrounding housing authority obligations, there is another issue: whether the techniques used by the redevelopment agencies are adequate to determine whether there is sufficient public housing for relocation.

In HHFA form 6122, it is not sufficiently clear whether the figure for public housing units available is equal to the number of units guaranteed to the relocatees, or is equal to the total number of units expected to become available.

There are also problems on the demand side. For HHFA, agencies prepare an estimate of the number of families expected to 'require' public housing. In some cases these estimates are based
solely on the total number of families who qualify for public housing. In other cases, the estimate is apparently modified by taking into account the expressed preference of the relocatees.

Since there is considerable latitude in the willingness of people to consider going into public housing, it is clearly important to take preferences into account when estimating the demand for public housing. Over allocating demand to public housing will result in an underestimate of the demand that the private housing market must satisfy.

In answering question 2.2, only one agency made it clear that they take family desire into account in determining demand for public housing. Although four other agencies stated that they used interviews to determine demand, they did not make clear whether the interview schedule probed people's preference in addition to gathering 'socio-economic data.' It is also possible that an agency may gather information about preferences but not use it in determining demand. The agency should make explicit the procedure used in determining demand for public housing.

b. Determining Demand and Supply in Advance: Private Housing

The determination of private housing supply and demand suffers from the technical shortcomings detailed in section III B.

c. Determining Demand and Supply in Advance: A General Observation

It should be made clear to agencies that merely citing sources of data is not sufficient answer to the question "How do you determine supply and demand?" A detailed description of
the procedure followed is necessary.

d. Reaction to Inadequate Housing Supply

Only four agencies acknowledged "having ever found the housing supply inadequate in condition, rent, location, or suitability for relocatees." Of these, only two indicated that they anticipated the problem and undertook an active remedial program. Only one agency indicated seeking remedy through 221 d 3 housing.

Some agencies that denied having ever found relocation housing inadequate were nevertheless undertaking remedial programs. It would seem that agencies are reluctant to admit that the housing situation is inadequate, even when they undertake building programs.

One agency indicated that the housing shortage was discovered in the course of carrying out a project. The remedy taken was to advertise locally for units, meanwhile shifting the families on the site so that the project could proceed.

North Adams Redevelopment Authority indicates that they found the housing supply inadequate, and that the costs of the remedy are "insured by the city of North Adams." It would be interesting to find out the details of their program.

There is additional discussion of the behavior of agencies faced with housing shortages in section III B.

e. Criteria for Standard Housing

6.15 What standards does agency use to determine whether housing is standard or not?

Of the responding agencies only seven answered this
question meaningfully. One renewal agency even answered that they use federal regulations (the HHFA issues guidelines for the setting of local standards, but setting standards is a local responsibility under urban renewal).

Four of the seven agencies who gave meaningful responses use the Massachusetts Sanitary Code, Article II, Minimum Standards of Fitness of Human Habitation.

The other three agencies use their city building codes.

f. Other Questionnaire Responses on Housing Supply

In response to open ended questions, 7 and 8, agencies most frequently mentioned housing supply issues. These were referred to on seven different submissions. In order of frequency of mention the issues were:

(4)-the shortage of apartments for large families at low rents, and the shortage of low rent housing in general.
(2)-the unreasonable level of rents for persons receiving welfare assistance.
(1)-the necessity for more realistic and specific enumeration of relocation resources prior to approval of new projects.
(1)-the need to encourage housing authorities to fulfill commitments in accepting relocatees.

2. Community Involvement and Relations; Including the Problem of Discrimination.

There is considerable variation in how households are first notified about projects, and in how involved they become in contributing to the design of residential projects.
Some agencies write families an explanatory letter as the project enters the planning stage, explaining the objectives of the project and telling them that an interviewer will approach them to assist in the development of the project. Some agencies, in addition, arrange block meetings. Other agencies are more formal and tell residents that they will have a chance to voice their ideas and recommendations during a public hearing.

Some agencies rely on newspapers to break the news about the project, and establish direct contact for the first time with an official letter which informs the recipient that "the property you occupy at the above address has been acquired... ."

Still other agencies hand deliver their informational letter. But there are apparently many different effects that can be achieved with a hand delivered letter.

One agency hand delivers a letter (this is their first contact with the family) which begins:

The dwelling in which you now reside has been purchased by the Redevelopment Authority for the purpose of demolishing it so that the entire area can be redeveloped.

The person is expected to sign a statement certifying that the letter has been hand delivered and explained, and agreeing to move within one year.

Other hand delivered letters emphasize the ways in which the agency hopes to be helpful.

In Malden and other communities, contact is maintained by frequent visits of a case worker who discusses the project, as well
as the household's problems.

The timing, content and tone of contacts with residents is critical to the establishment of good relations between residents and the displacing agency.

One agency sent a rather abrupt first letter announcing that property had been acquired, and that rent was payable to the agency. The director of this agency commented, "...The most difficult problem would seem to be breaking the barrier of hostility and mistrust."

Clearly agency relations with project area people are important, but there are diverse agency attitudes to the utility of good relations. Some agencies seem to try to involve the site occupants in the design of the project, while others seek good relations as a basis for relocation assistance; still others would appear to desire good relations only to expedite uncomplicated site clearance and property management.

In the questionnaire, discrimination was cited by two agencies as a difficult problem. Other agencies made the same observation orally. As part of their relocation program, at least two agencies are working with their communities to overcome discrimination in housing.

3. Social Service Issues

On open-ended questions, five agencies cited social service issues.

Three agencies mentioned the need of casework services in relocation programs. Reflecting on their experience these agencies said:
- that there should be a mandatory survey of multi-problem families prior to approval of projects. (Brockton Redevelopment Authority)
- that family service is "very urgently needed" (Dedham Housing Authority)
- that caseworkers should devote more time to people after relocation. (New Bedford Redevelopment Authority)

Two agencies stressed the need for coordination of public and private services to assist families. One of these agencies suggested that the state take initiative in arranging a conference between social agencies and LPA's.

4. Staff Issues

In response to open ended questions two agencies talked about the need to improve the expertise and status of relocation personnel.

The Dedham Housing Authority, observing that "relocation should be viewed as a more important element of the renewal process" proposed Bureau sponsored lectures and seminars on the social problems of slum areas and "human renewal."

SHORT ANSWERS

1. Consistency Test

In discussions with agency relocation officers, executives, and others, I was warned of the possibility of fabricated data. It is not possible to detect fabricated data with certainty, but as a pre-
caution a test was performed to check the internal consistency of
three sets of data. The data on the number of poor households was
combined with the data on rent distribution, and checked against the
data provided on distribution of percent income spent on gross rent.26

Only three agencies provided all three sets of data needed
to perform the consistency test. The data for these agencies seemed
satisfactory.

2. Characteristics and Needs of Displaced Families

From data provided by displacing agencies, the informa-
tion in Table 10 has been tabulated.

A quick examination of the grand totals gives an indication
of need among displaced families for whom data was supplied: 61.7% 
were poor, 20.0% elderly, 57.6% non-white, 20.8% on welfare, 81.4%
lived in non-standard housing, 58.7% were crowded, 87.6% were 
paying greater than 20% and 68.8% were paying greater than 25% of 
their income for rent.

When the displacement activity is grouped by city size and 
by SMSA, some interesting observations can be made. There are eight 
indices of need. Cities of over 100,000 population scored above 
average (high need) on seven out of eight of these indices. Smaller 
cities were above average on, at most, one index of need. That is, 
cities between 50,000 and 100,000 population had an above average 
proportion of elderly displacees, and cities between 10,000 and 25,000 
had an above average proportion of displacees in non-standard units.

One cannot be sure, but it appears that percent overcrowded 
is a better indicator than percent non-standard that an above average
TABLE 10*

PERFORMANCE . . . NEED

PERCENT OF POOR, ELDERLY, NON-WHITE, WELFARE, IN NON-STANDARD HOUSING AND OVER CROWDED HOUSEHOLDS. PERCENT OF ALL HOUSEHOLDS PAYING GREATER THAN 20 PERCENT AND GREATER THAN 25% OF INCOME FOR RENT. ALL DATA ON BEFORE RELOCATION CONDITIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Displacing Activity</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Non-standard</th>
<th>Crowded</th>
<th>Greater than 20% on Rent</th>
<th>Greater than 25% on Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td>0.**</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cities Aggregated by Size

<p>| Pop. Under 10T | 0.   | 0.   | 0.   | 0.   | 0.   | 0.   |
| Pop. Between 10 and 25T | 43.6 | 10.1 | .7  | 0.   | 84.2 | 0.   |
| Pop. Between 25 and 50T  | 21.6 | 15.5 | 2.9 | 3.5  | 0.   | 9.2  |
| Pop. Between 50 and 100T | 43.0 | 26.2 | 8.1 | 10.9 | 72.1 | 4.6  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMSA'S</th>
<th>Pop. Over 100T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.0+ 20.7+ 77.5+ 24.9 82.5+ 87.2+ 93.4+ 73.8+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>69.6+ 29.4 80.3+ 18.9 91.6+ 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>51.1 11.4 66.5+ 34.7 86.4+ 69.5+ 90.0+ 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>38.9 24.6 5.1 7.2 75.8 9.2 41.7 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>91.6 25.7 67.9+ 39.0 58.9 97.0+ 93.8+ 79.2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>61.7 20.0 57.6 20.8 81.4 58.7 87.6 68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10 is the same as Chart 12 of the MAD Program, Appendix A.

**Please note that "0" stands for both "no data" and for "zero value."
proportion are spending over 20% and over 25% of their income on rent. Observe that Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee SMSA had a below average percent of relocatees in non-standard units, but was far above average in percent of households overcrowded, and was above average in percent of households paying greater than 20% and greater than 25% of their income for rent.

In sum there would appear to be a concentration of above average indices of relocatee need in the Commonwealth's larger cities.


Table 11 indicates that there are a few agencies in the state with large relocation staffs which can probably be called upon to assist new and/or smaller agencies. Some agencies have been called upon to assist by performing relocation for others. Another point which the table does not make apparent is the common agency practice of contracting for assistance from local settlement houses and other service organizations. This practice has been noted among relocation agencies of all sizes.

Table 12 shows that average cost of the urban renewal relocation workload in 1965. The highest cost of relocation per household, $779, occurred in a middle-sized agency. By comparison, Mr. Lawrence Miller, Director of Operations of the New York City Central Relocation Bureau, estimated in a conversation with me that per household cost of relocation for his agency is about $700 to $1,000, probably closer to the latter figure. Of this sum, probably several hundred (approximately $300) are paid out in bonus fees to finders, or tenants.
**TABLE 11**

RELOCATION AGENCIES, BY SIZE OF RELOCATION STAFF AND CAUSES OF DISLOCATION, AS OF APRIL 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Size</th>
<th>Total Agencies</th>
<th>Urban Renewal</th>
<th>Dept. Public Works</th>
<th>Public Bldgs.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>16 (2)**</td>
<td>11 (2)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>4 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and Up</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11 is the same as Chart 5 of the MAD Program, Appendix A.

**Numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of agencies who have done relocation for another agency.
**TABLE 12***

AVERAGE COST OF URBAN RENEWAL WORKLOAD IN 1965  
(Total Does Not Include Cost of Property Taken)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Cost</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cost Per Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>594,196</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Expense Payments</td>
<td>147,872</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Adjustment Payments</td>
<td>85,922</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assistance Paying Rent</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of Regular Staff</td>
<td>353,818</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of Case Workers</td>
<td>47,840</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Cost of Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Household =</td>
<td></td>
<td>779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 is the same as Chart 12 of the MAD Program, Appendix A.*
In Massachusetts, both urban renewal and public works displacements claimed to regard all displaced households as eligible for assistance. But it was not clear whether all households were eligible for both moving costs and advisory assistance, or merely one of these.

Table 13 summarizes the relocation services offered in addition to the traditional listing of standard vacancies. Caution should be observed in interpreting this table. The services checked are those either currently offered or which will be offered in a contemplated project. These services are not necessarily the same as offered in the most recently completed projects, which are the subjects of previous tables.

With this caution in mind, these observations are made: Urban renewal programs offer considerably more services than other displacing programs. There is variation in the number of services offered by size of city; smaller cities seem to offer fewer services. There is considerable variation of the average number of services offered by SMSA's. The Boston SMSA offers the lowest average number of services of all SMSA's for which there is data.

The actual quality of the services offered cannot be evaluated here; this will require extensive fieldwork, and additional data.

Table 13 does offer a data base to assist the development of a program to upgrade the numbers and quality of services offered to relocatees.

Table 14 tabulates additional information on the procedures of agencies. The average number of households at taking varies considerably, ranging up to 993 families. The cost of relocation per
TABLE 13

PERFORMANCE . . . PROCEDURES

NUMBER OF AGENCIES OFFERING OR INTENDING TO OFFER THE FOLLOWING RELOCATION SERVICES AS OF APRIL 1966.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Displacing Activity</th>
<th>Average No. of Services</th>
<th>Total Agencies</th>
<th>Short Term Counseling</th>
<th>Referral to Social Welfare</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Medical Assistance</th>
<th>Relocation Adjustment</th>
<th>Other Rent Assistance</th>
<th>Other 1-Addition</th>
<th>Other 2-Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>META</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cities Aggregated by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Average No. of Services</th>
<th>Total Agencies</th>
<th>Short Term Counseling</th>
<th>Referral to Social Welfare</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Medical Assistance</th>
<th>Relocation Adjustment</th>
<th>Other Rent Assistance</th>
<th>Other 1-Addition</th>
<th>Other 2-Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Under 10T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 10 and 25T</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 25 and 50T</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 50 and 100T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Over 100T</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSA'S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13 is the same as Chart 13 in the MAD Program, Appendix A.*
**TABLE 14**

**PERFORMANCE PROCEEDURES (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Displacing Activity</th>
<th>Total Agencies</th>
<th>Average No. of Households</th>
<th>Cost Per Household in Most Recent Project</th>
<th>Percent Lost Between Survey and Taking</th>
<th>No. Survey Advanced</th>
<th>No. Changs Viz. Survey</th>
<th>By No. Done</th>
<th>By Feel No. of Families</th>
<th>By Race About Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cities Aggregated by Size**

<p>| Pop. Under 10T              | 2              | 0                        | 0                                        | 0                                     | 1                   | 1                      | 0           | 0                      | 0                 |
| Pop. Between 10 and 25T     | 6              | 141                      | 385                                      | 53                                    | 5                   | 2                      | 0           | 0                      | 1                 |
| Pop. Between 25 and 50T     | 3              | 231                      | 66                                       | 13                                    | 2                   | 1                      | 0           | 0                      | 1                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>291</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Between 50 and 100T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. Over 100T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SMSA'S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMSA's</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>803</th>
<th>799</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14 is the same as Chart 14 in the MAD Program, Appendix A.*
household does not seem to be related to the number of households at taking. It is surprising that cost varies so widely; it ranges from $66 to $779. I have not studied the budgets closely, but it would be worthwhile to discover what the great variation is due to.

In some instances, the number of households on the site diminishes between the survey and taking. Agencies were asked to provide the number of households on the site at survey time and at taking. Reporting of dates was not good enough to establish the time lapse between survey and taking for most agencies. The percent of households lost between survey and taking must be interpreted without the benefit of knowing the time elapsed. Most displacing agencies, cities, and SMSA's have what seem to be moderate rates of loss, with the exception of towns having population between 10,000 and 25,000. For these towns, with a total of six reporting agencies, the average loss of households between survey and taking was 53%. Such a high rate of loss may indicate very serious deficiencies in agency procedure, depending on the circumstances. What happens to services and maintenance in an area which has lost a large proportion of its families? What financial losses are landlords and businessmen forced to take while awaiting the time when the taking agency finally makes its move?

Of course, a high rate of loss would be less serious if there were a short lapse of time between survey and taking, but given 141 as the average number of households at taking, it is hard to imagine almost 150 families leaving a site in a very short period of time. This issue should be explored by the Bureau of Relocation.

Table 14 records the number of agencies which performed
surveys of housing conditions and relocation requirements before taking, and also the number of agencies which changed the planning or timing of the displacing project because of the results of these surveys. Over half of the agencies performing advance surveys report changing their projects’ design or timing.

Unfortunately, I neglected to ask a direct follow up question to find out what kind of change in the project was caused by the advanced survey. From other essays in the questionnaire I have the impression that approximately half the time an attempt was made to directly improve relocation housing resources, while the other half of the time the response was to lengthen the move out period so that the turn-over would eventually absorb the displacees. There is clearly room to improve the performance of agencies in dealing with inadequate relocation housing supply.

Part of relocation procedure should be the gathering of data which will enable evaluation, and improvement of programs. The number of agencies collecting this kind of follow-up data reveals the lack of concern about relocation's effects. Only one-third of agencies gathered information about how families felt after their moves. Less than a tenth of the agencies collected data about the geographic distribution of non-white and low income relocatees. Considering the propensity of displacement to affect these disadvantaged groups, the lack of follow-up is a serious shortcoming.

4. Reaching Relocatees.

Table 15, which documents how well agencies have reached households, shows that much is left to be desired in agency book-keeping, and reporting.
### TABLE 15*  
**PERFORMANCE . . . REACHING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Displacing Activity</th>
<th>Average Household Moving Cost Payment</th>
<th>Percent Household Paid Moving Costs</th>
<th>Proportion of Poor Assisted</th>
<th>Average Relocation Adjustment Payment</th>
<th>Average Other Rent Adjustment Payment</th>
<th>Percent Agency Referrred</th>
<th>Percent Self-Relocated</th>
<th>Percent Inspected Before</th>
<th>Percent Inspected After</th>
<th>Percent Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>59.44</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>161.7</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cities Aggregated by Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pop. Under 10T</th>
<th>1494.57</th>
<th>23.4</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>0.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. Between 10 and 25T</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>297.2</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. Between 25 and 50T</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>297.2</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSA'S</td>
<td>Pop. Between 50 and 100 T</td>
<td>Pop. Over 100T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>370.0</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>46.78</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>152.7</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>297.2</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>114.37</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>343.3</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>59.44</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>161.7</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15 is the same as Chart 25 in the MAD Program, Appendix A.

**Number of households receiving some form of rent payment divided by number of 'poor' households (see footnote 3).
The percent of households who received moving costs, and the average household moving cost payment seem erratic. The major cause of this is that some agencies recorded the number of households who received payments and failed to record the amount of the payments; other agencies did the reverse. One agency apparently included moving costs paid to businesses.

I believe agencies have a dual obligation: first, to inform families of their rights to receive moving costs; and second, to maintain records so that their performance can be evaluated and improved if necessary.

Agencies have been utilizing the relocation adjustment payment authorized in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964, but unless the majority of poor families is going into public or other subsidized housing, it appears, observing the proportion receiving rent supplements (Table 15), that extended coverage of poor families is needed.

The Bureau of Relocation should study performance of the subsidy system, and recommend revision where necessary.

Responses about whether households were agency referred or self relocated were frequently inconsistent. These two categories are mutually exclusive and exhaustive, and the sum of households in the categories should be equal to the number of households at taking. Percent agency referred plus percent self-relocated should equal one hundred. In Table 15 there are four cases where the sum is less than 90%, three cases where the sum is less than 80%, and two cases where the sum is less than 70%. There is even one case where the sum is greater than a hundred.
Clearly, this data on agency referrals and self relocation is inconsistent.

Agency reporting, and perhaps, agency bookkeeping, of performance in reaching households is seriously deficient. The quality of this information must be improved to permit Bureau analysis and evaluation of the quality of relocation assistance.

5. Helping Relocatees.

From an examination of Table 16 it appears that the agencies providing data have vastly improved the percent of households in standard housing, and have somewhat alleviated overcrowding.

Only three of the twenty-one reporting agencies were able to provide data on the cost of changed housing. (See Table 17.) To evaluate improvement in relocatees' level of living, it is necessary to know the change in the cost of housing.

Of the three agencies with data, one showed a negligible increase ($0.80) in average gross monthly rent, and the other two showed increases of $12.60 and $10.10. One agency showed relocatees spending a smaller median percent of income on rent, but another agency showed a rise in the median percent of income spent on gross rent from 16.7% to 30.7%. All three agencies indicated that self-relocated households had a higher median gross monthly rent than households agency referred to private housing.

The evaluation of whether an agency has helped relocatees is exceedingly difficult; this paper is not the place for an attempt. It is appropriate to discuss briefly, though, how evaluation might proceed.
### TABLE 16

**HOUSING CONDITIONS BEFORE AND AFTER RELOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Displacing Activity</th>
<th>Percent Households Crowded Before</th>
<th>Percent Households Crowded After</th>
<th>Percent Non-Standard Households Before</th>
<th>Percent Non-Standard Households After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cities Aggregated by Size**

<p>| Pop. Under 10T                     | 0.0                              | 0.0                              | 25.0                                   | 0.0                                   |
| Pop. Between 10 and 25T            | 0.0                              | 0.0                              | 84.2                                   | 3.8                                   |
| Pop. Between 25 and 50T            | 9.2                              | 7.8                              | 0.0                                    | 0.0                                   |
| Pop. Between 50 and 100T           | 4.6                              | 1.1                              | 72.1                                   | 1.4                                   |
| Pop. Over 100T                     | 87.2                             | 62.1                             | 82.5                                   | 2.9                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMSA'S</th>
<th>Percent Households Crowded Before</th>
<th>Percent Households Crowded After</th>
<th>Non-Standard Households Before</th>
<th>Non-Standard Households After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg-Leominster</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence-Haverhill</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16 is the same as Chart 16 in the MAD Program, Appendix A.*
### Table 17

**Median Gross Rent (Before and After), Median Percent Income Spent on Rent (Before and After), Median Gross Rent Self and Agency Relocated for Three Reporting Agencies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Median Gross Rent Before</th>
<th>Median Gross Rent After</th>
<th>Median Percent Income Spent on Rent Before</th>
<th>Median Percent Income Spent on Rent After</th>
<th>Median Gross Rent Self Relocated</th>
<th>Median Gross Rent Agency Relocated*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not including public housing.*
In addition to studying changes in housing condition, crowding, and housing cost, other factors should be considered. Are there income changes which can be traced to the move? Are there changes in the cost of required transportation to work and facilities which can be attributed to the move? Are there changes in the quality of the neighborhood that relocatees live in? How are recreation, educational, medical, and commercial facilities? Has segregation been increased or decreased? What are the social changes accompanying relocation?

Further, there is the problem of how to measure the disturbance of a family forced to move, and how to weigh this against improvement in their situation.

There is also the issue of scale. At what level of aggregation should the evaluation of relocation costs and benefits proceed?

Because of the difficulty of weighting different factors to achieve an overall evaluation of relocation, I suggest that any program of evaluation will depend heavily on the feelings of the people affected by relocation.

The Bureau of Relocation will have to pursue the problems of evaluation and develop an operational and reasonable procedure. The discussion of financial standards in section II suggests an approach that should be explored.

6. Agency Reactions to Different Forms of Assistance

The following is an analysis of responses to question eight which read:
8. Do you think that the following forms of state assistance would be:

1. very useful
2. useful
3. harmful, or a nuisance
4. no opinion

The proposals are arranged in descending order of positive agency reaction in Table 18.

The strongest, most positive reaction was to having an informal conference to exchange ideas about relocation. Related to this was the strong endorsement of training programs for relocation personnel. In conversation, relocation personnel frequently said that they needed guidance in performing their jobs. The earlier analysis of agency procedures indicates that there is much to be gained by developing an educational program for relocation personnel.

In a similar vein, agencies reacted positively to the proposal for introduction of a standardized record keeping system. Two agencies felt that this would be harmful, but adoption of the record keeping system could be optional, so long as an agency complies with the Bureau's data requirements.

Most responding agencies apparently felt that the introduction of standard criteria and procedures for evaluating relocation housing would assist them. Again, these procedures and standards could be developed for agency guidance; adoption could be optional providing the agency were within Bureau requirements.

There was a prevalent but not a particularly strong positive feeling about the usefulness of information on the size of anticipated relocation projects of neighboring cities and towns. The Bureau should be collecting this data as a matter of course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Positive Reactions</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Harmful or Nuisance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>informal conference to exchange ideas about relocation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>relocation personnel training programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>introduction of standard criteria and procedures for evaluating relocation housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>introduction of a standardized record keeping system, suitable for use in preparing all types of reports</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information on size of anticipated relocation projects of neighboring cities or towns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detailed reports on metropolitan area housing supply and demand; especially low income housing supply and demand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a program similar to federal 221 d 3, but applicable to all areas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulations permitting taking agency to list dwellings inspected recently, and found standard, by other agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a long term rent supplement program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduction of standard procedures for relocation assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relocation personnel recruiting programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a short term rent supplement program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provision for your agency to carry out rehabilitation of relocation housing, outside project area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>centralized computer service for help in preparation of data for relocation plans and reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agencies felt more strongly that detailed reports on metropolitan area housing supply and demand, especially low income housing supply and demand, would be useful.

It is interesting to point out that if the proposals are ranked in decreasing order of the number of 'very useful' responses, then the leading five 'very useful' proposals are all concerned with providing technical assistance to the agencies. (See Table 19.) Technical assistance emerges as the most strongly perceived need of the agencies.

Still on Table 19, notice that recommendations for legislation appear in sixth and seventh place. More than half of the responding agencies felt that a state program similar to federal 221 d 3 but applicable to all areas would be useful. Almost the same number of agencies felt that a long term rent supplement program would be useful. Fewer agencies felt that a short term rent supplement would be useful; three felt that it would be harmful, pointing to the difficulty of someone who had been subsidized for a year but who had not succeeded in raising their income in that time to meet housing costs.

In summary, I think that there are two areas of activity of prime importance for the Bureau of Relocation: One is providing technical assistance for agencies, and the other is developing documentation for legislation.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No. of &quot;Very Useful&quot; Votes</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>informal conference to exchange ideas about relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>introduction of a standardized record keeping system, suitable for use in preparing all types of reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>relocation personnel training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>detailed reports on metropolitan area housing supply and demand; especially low income housing supply and demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>introduction of standard criteria and procedures for evaluating relocation housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a program similar to federal 221 d 3, but applicable to all areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>a long term rent supplement program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>introduction of standard procedures for relocation assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>regulations permitting taking agency to list dwellings inspected recently, and found standard, by other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>provision for your agency to carry out rehabilitation of relocation housing, outside project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>information on size of anticipated relocation projects of neighboring cities or towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>relocation personnel recruiting programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a short term rent supplement program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>centralized computer service for help in preparation of data for relocation plans and reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of "Harmful or Nuisance" Votes

1
2
1
1
1
0
2
0
2
4
1
2
2
3
3
3
IV. CONCLUSIONS

The recommendations of this study are grouped under six headings:

- Resolving conflict between programs
- Estimating housing supply and demand
- Anticipating household relocation problems
- Feed-back of housing and other relocation problems to project design and timing
- Upgrading relocation assistance
- Supporting programs and policies

Resolving Conflict Between Programs and Projects

1. There should be a State Planning office with a Board of Review consisting of representatives of different programs. The responsibility of this group would be to report to the Governor, suggesting at what rate different programs should proceed so that proper relocation remains feasible.

Determining priorities between projects depending on the same housing resources should be an explicit process. Without established priorities between projects, there is likely to be a race between projects to get relocation plans approved, leaving the loser with a difficult or impossible relocation task. It is important that the sequence of projects not be left to this kind of procedure; relative values of projects should enter into sequencing.
Estimating Housing Supply and Demand

2. The Bureau of Relocation (in cooperation with the Housing Division) should create and administer a data system for monitoring housing supply in the Commonwealth's metropolitan areas. Relocation cannot be successful without adequate housing resources.

There are several reasons why the Bureau should not rely on relocation agencies to evaluate the housing supply. The most important reason is that the agencies do not have the appropriate geographic base for such a study. Another important reason is that it would appear difficult to get agencies to perform serious and honest analyses when the record shows that housing problems which conflict with project implementation are obscured, or understated or disregarded.

It would probably be as easy for the Bureau to conduct its own housing studies as it would be to police agency studies.

Furthermore, the Bureau could produce metropolitan area housing supply reports using fewer staff than the total required if the same work were done by local agencies.

In addition, if the Bureau is to act as a clearing house in providing housing information for projects in early stages of planning, it would be to the Bureau's advantage to be intimately familiar with the housing supply surveys; this would be difficult if these studies were performed by agencies.

The studies conceived would estimate vacancy rates and turnover rates for small sub-areas of metropolitan markets. Information would be developed from housing censuses, utility on/offs, building
completions, demolitions, and conversions. Both vacancy and turnover rates should be cross-tabulated by zones, rents, number of rooms, tenure type, structure type, neighborhood type, and provision of transportation and other community services.

**Anticipating Household Relocation Problems**

3. Diagnostic surveys of household need for relocation housing and assistance should be fitted to the type and circumstances of the project.

For example, predominantly residential urban renewal projects should have the participation of project area citizens in drawing relocation plans. Effective citizen involvement must begin early in the development of the renewal plan.

For other types of projects, the need for detailed diagnostic studies must be weighed against the 'wet-blanket' effect of announcing tentative project areas. In this instance a set of successively more detailed diagnostic studies should be tentatively planned, with the decision to carry out the next stage depending on the results of the prior stage.

The first stage diagnostic study would require information that is readily available or can be gathered without disturbing the community. The police lists, insurance atlases, census materials, and records of welfare and other agencies could be utilized to develop a picture of the social and economic character of the project area households. The rehousing needs of the households could be estimated on the basis of current occupancy, and some of the likely relocation problems could be anticipated using the frequency of different household types combined with indirect indicators of need for assistance.
If this preliminary study indicates that there is likely to be a difficult rehousing problem or a high incidence of hardship, the decision may be made to study an alternate project area, to study the given project area in greater depth, to combine these approaches, or to drop the project.

4. Federal, State and city funds should be available to finance local diagnostic studies.

For urban renewal projects such funds are already available. For other types of projects funds should be available for neighborhood based groups to carry on their own diagnostic studies. Provision should be made for the local group, composed of representatives of residents, businesses and institutions, to have the support of a professional planning staff.

When alternate project sites become public knowledge, neighborhoods should have the option of organizing joint or independent studies to determine in some detail the relocation requirements of the alternate project sites. The study should cover organizational costs and problems of relocation planning, and also the problems of households directly and indirectly affected by the proposed relocation. This should include an estimate of the housing requirements of the households to be relocated, and the likely hardships posed for disadvantaged households.

The local diagnostic studies will provide data which can serve as a partial basis for choosing between different project designs and sequences. The studies would also provide the basis for planning of relocation housing and services. A side benefit to the community would be the usefulness of a study to the planning of community services, in the event it is decided not to use a particular site for a project.
5. The Bureau of Relocation should require notice of the approximate date and the approximate number of families to be displaced when the first tentative proposals for siting the project are completed.

The Bureau should then require an estimate of the costs of relocation, including the approximate net costs of relocation housing. These estimates of relocation costs should be utilized in Cost-Benefit studies of project desirability.

The Bureau will not disclose information about the site, until the site proposal is public information.

This recommendation is important because it provides for early warning of impending housing shortages. It is difficult to remedy a shortage of relocation housing quickly; early recognition of future relocation housing shortages helps assure sufficient lead time so that relocation housing can be on the ground to coincide with the schedule of the displacing project, thereby avoiding project delays.

6. The Bureau of Relocation should have responsibility for reviewing applications for grants to carry out local diagnostic studies.

The contents of the local diagnostic study, specified in Recommendation 4, together with the housing supply studies of the Bureau and with other information provided by the displacing agency, should provide a basis for discussions leading to the development of a relocation plan. The responsibility for the adequacy of the relocation plan should rest with the displacing agency.

The purpose of having an option for a neighborhood diagnostic study is to provide an opportunity for a neighborhood to present
technically and in detail its relocation requirements, and to give the proposed project area an opportunity to bargain for its interests during the early design stages of a project.

**Upgrading Relocation Assistance**

7. It should be Bureau of Relocation policy to help improve the expertise and status of relocation workers.

Many relocation workers showed a willingness to do a good job, but said they required assistance developing their programs. There seemed to be particularly strong endorsement for an informal conference of Commonwealth relocation workers and outside specialists where information and experience could be traded.

In addition to setting up the conference, the Bureau should seek, through field visits and other means, to provide technical and assistance/to maintain good communication with the agency relocation workers.

Most important, the Bureau should help to develop in relocation personnel the capability to recognize relocation housing shortages and to formulate meaningful programs to overcome the shortages.

8. The Bureau of Relocation should require (and assist agencies to keep) records suitable for the evaluation and improvement of relocation programs:

The analysis of the questionnaire indicates that few agencies keep records of the kind suitable for evaluation of relocation. This data is needed to put improvement of relocation on a firm empirical footing.
Supporting Programs and Policies

Some modification of and additions to existing Federal and state programs are suggested here.

9. A program similar to 221 d-3 should be developed, but its application should not be limited to areas with comprehensive plans.

10. For renters, a long term rent supplement program should be provided to keep housing costs within household budgets.

Agencies frequently pointed to the problem of finding suitable housing within the financial means of large families and poor families.

11. Agencies should have the power to renovate housing for relocation purposes even if the housing is outside the project area.

12. For displaced owners, there should be a program which guarantees sufficient funds for rehousing.

Frequently, the fair market price is not sufficient payment to enable the household to secure replacement housing. For such cases there should be provision for some form of government subsidy. One possible arrangement would have the displaced owner 'invest' in the program that portion of the payment for property which is left after satisfying debt obligations. Utilizing the metropolitan housing surveys prepared by the Bureau, it should be possible to determine a rate of return sufficient to permit a choice between a satisfactory selection of relocation dwellings, both rental and sales. At any time the household would be free to withdraw its original 'investment' and forego continued subsidy.

13. For the immediate relief of the crises in relocation programming Congress should extend the deadline for the disbursement of Interstate Highway funds.
RR GELARDIN QUESTIONNAIRE

DIMENSION TEXP(360,EDIM), TOTD(360,EDIM), TGRB(324,GDIM), TGRA(3124,GDIM), TGRSF(324,GDIM), TGRAG(324,GDIM), TPRB(360,EDIM), TPR(2360,EDIM), TGRB(324,GDIM), TGRA(324,GDIM), TGRSF(324,GDIM), TGRAG(324,GDIM), TPRB(360,EDIM), TPR(2360,GDIM), TSRV(360,EDIM), TCST(360,EDIM), TOTD(360,EDIM), TOTD(360,EDIM), S(42,SDIM), SS(42,SDIM)

V'S EDIM=2,1,10
V'S GDIM=2,1,10
V'S SDIM=2,1,6

DIMENSION AAA(2160,ADIM)

PROGRAM COMMON SPELL, AAA, GRBMD, GRAMD, PRBMD, PRAMD, GRSFMD, GRAGMD, HAC, CH65, PHPoor, PHEL, PHNW, PNSTDB, PHCRDB, G20P, PRB20P, P2RB25, TSRV, NTMPD, AHAT, CHH, SMIT, PLS, TSUR, TSURCH, TRACE, TINCUM, THF3EEL, AHMC, PHMC, PP, ARAP, AHOTP, PHAG, PHSREL, PHINSB, PHINSA, PHLOST, P4PHCRDA, PNSTDA, WL65, WL66, WL67, TCST65

DIMENSION MRP45(36), MR6P(36)

DIMENSION TNRNTB(36), TNRNTB(36), THMC(36), TRAP(36), THOTP(36), TA1ST1(36), TAST2(36), TAST3(36), THAT45(36), PHEb(36), PHMC65(36), TH2POOR(36), PMRP45(36), PHWEL(36), PHATSM(36)

DIMENSION TPOHH(36), TELHH(36), TNEHH(36)

DIMENSION GRBMD(36), GRAMD(36), GRSFMD(36), GRAGMD(36), PRBMD(36)

DIMENSION PERP(36), PERE(36), PERNW(36)

DIMENSION TMBRS(36), TPTR(200), TSA1(36), TSA2(36), TSA3(36), TSUR1(36), TSURCH(36), THSGSP(36), TH64(36), TH65(36), THE64(36), THE65(36), 25(36), AST1(36), AST2(36), THCO65(36), TH66(36), TH67(36), THMC65(36), TROT(36), TH100(36), THAT(36), THELD(36), TH6N6(36), TH112(36), 4, TH1123(36), TH1213(36), TH1214(36), THWEL(36), TSTDDB(36), TNSTD3(36), TSTD(36), TNSDTA(36), TNSTD(36), TOFC(36), DH100D(36), HATC(36), DDCF(36), 66), DMOVD(36), TSTDA1(36), TSTDA2(36), TSTDA(36), AHMC(36), PP(36), ARAP(36), AHOTP(36), PH6INSB(36), PHINSA(36), THLOST(36), THFEEL(36), THCRD8A(36), TRACE(36), TINCUM(36), TSTDA1(36), TNSTD(36), AID(15), EXP(198)

DIMENSION PTR(18), CST(7), CST65(7), GRB(9), GRA(9), PRb(7), PRA(7), 1, GRSF(9), GRAG(9), H100D(36), TH100E(36), TH100N(36), TH100P(36), T2H100W(36), PPRP(36), EHPR3(36), EHLED(36), EHNW(36), WL65(36), WL66(36), WL67(36), CH55(36), TSL(36), TSL100(36), G20P(36), THATC(36), 4, CHH(36), TM100S(36), SMIT(36), HATC(36), AHAT(36), NTMPD(36), 5, AHMC(36), PP(36), ARAP(36), AHOTP(36), PH6INSB(36), PHINSA(36), TSTDA(36), TNSD(36), AID(15), EXP(198)

DIMENSION PLS(200), M100S(200), PRA20(200), PHPoor(200), PRb20(20), PRA25(200), PRA20(20), PRA25(200), HSGSP(200), SURCH(200), TINCUM(200), QFC(10), PMHC(200), PHAG(200), PPH(200), PHSREL(200), PLOST(200), PHS(200), PHS(200), PHSREL(200), PLOST(200), PHS(200), PHS(200), PHSREL(200), PLOST(200), PHCRD64(200)

INTEGER AID


INTEGER XX

DIMENSION SPELL(155, SP)

V'S SP= 2,1,5

THROUGH CQ, FOR N=1,1,N, G=31

CQ

READ FORMAT NAM, SPELL(N,1) ... SPELL(N,5)
V'S NAM=$4C6,C4*$
INTEGER SR
T1=0.
T2=0.
T3=0.
T4=0.
HAC=0.
THROUGH BU, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.36
TPOHH(Z)=0.
TELHH(Z)=0.
TNWHH(Z)=0.
TMBRS(Z)=0.
THROUGH CC1, FOR C=1,1,C.G.9
TEXP(Z,C)=0.
TSUR(Z)=0.
TSURCH(Z)=0.
TSA1(Z)=0.
TSA2(Z)=0.
TSA3(Z)=0.
THSGSP(Z)=0.
THROUGH HH, FOR SR=1,1,SR.G.9
TSRV(Z,SR)=0.
CONTINUE
TH100(Z)=0.
THAT(Z)=0.
THED(Z)=0.
THNW(Z)=0.
TH112(Z)=0.
TH213(Z)=0.
TH2134(Z)=0.
TH1123(Z)=0.
THWEL(Z)=0.
TSTDB(Z)=0.
TNSTDB(Z)=0.
TSTD(A)(Z)=0.
TNSTD(A)(Z)=0.
TRNTB(Z)=0.
TNRTNB(Z)=0.
THROUGH KK, FOR K=1,1,K.G.10
TCST(Z,K)=0.
TCST65(Z,K)=0.
CONTINUE
TCASEW(Z)=0.
THMC(Z)=0.
TRAP(Z)=0.
THOTP(Z)=0.
TH64(Z)=0.
TH65(Z)=0.
THEB64(Z)=0.
THEB65(Z)=0.
THCO65(Z)=0.
TAST1(Z)=0.
TAST2(Z)=0.
TAST3(Z)=0.
TH66(Z)=0.
TH67(Z) = 0.
THMC65(Z) = 0.
TROT(A) = 0.
THROUGH DDD, FOR D = 1, 1, D.G.7
TOTD(Z, D) = 0.

DDD
CONTINUE
TOFC(Z) = 0.
THAG(Z) = 0.
THPH(Z) = 0.
THSREL(Z) = 0.
THINSB(Z) = 0.
THINS(A)(Z) = 0.
THLOST(Z) = 0.
THFEEL(Z) = 0.
THCRDB(Z) = 0.
THCRDA(Z) = 0.
TRACE(Z) = 0.
TINCOM(Z) = 0.

THROUGH EE, FOR EE = 1, 1, E.G.9
TGRB(Z, E) = 0.
TGRA(Z, E) = 0.
TGRSF(Z, E) = 0.
TGRAG(Z, E) = 0.

EE
CONTINUE
THROUGH E5, FOR E = 1, 1, E.G.10
TPRB(Z, E) = 0.
TPRA(Z, E) = 0.

E5
CONTINUE
TPTR(Z) = 0.
TH100E(Z) = 0.
TH100N(Z) = 0.
TH100P(Z) = 0.
TH100W(Z) = 0.
TH100C(Z) = 0.
TH101C(Z) = 0.
THATC(Z) = 0.
HATC(Z) = 0.
G20P(Z) = 0.
H100D(Z) = 0.
TM100S(Z) = 0.
TLS(Z) = 0.
TLS100(Z) = 0.
THROUGH G2, FOR J = 1, 1, J.G.4
THROUGH G2, FOR G = 1, 1, G.G.15

G2
AAA(Z, J, G) = 0.
THAT45(Z) = 0.
MRP(Z) = 0.
MRP45(Z) = 0.

BU
CONTINUE
THROUGH IJ, FOR I = 1, 1, I.G.7
THROUGH IJ, FOR J = 1, 1, J.G.6
S(I, J) = 0.
SS(I, J) = 0.

IJ
CONTINUE
THROUGH CCC, FOR CD = 1, 1, CD.G.200
PRB20(CD)=0.
PRA20(CD)=0.
PRB25(CD)=0.
PRA25(CD)=0.
TPTR(CD)=0.
TPRB(CD,8)=0.
TPRA(CD,8)=0.

CONTINUE

TPOHH(20)=770.2*11.0
TPOHH(21)=43.6*10.8
TPOHH(22)=43.7*18.4
TPOHH(23)=24.8*13.7
TPOHH(24)=58.7*14.6
TPOHH(25)=45.2*12.6
TPOHH(26)=46.7*20.2
TPOHH(27)=22.2*12.5
TPOHH(28)=142.9*12.2
TPOHH(29)=94.7*12.9
TNWHH(20)=770.2*3.3
TNWHH(21)=43.6*1.2
TNWHH(22)=43.7*0.4
TNWHH(23)=24.8*1.3
TNWHH(24)=58.7*0.4
TNWHH(25)=45.2*1.2
TNWHH(26)=46.7*2.3
TNWHH(27)=22.2*1.2
TNWHH(28)=142.9*2.7
TNWHH(29)=94.7*0.8

READ FORMAT CARDS,CD,SUR,SURCH,HSGSP,SRV(1)***SRV(9),H64,H65
HEB64, HEB65, AST1, AST2, AST3, HCO65, H66, H67, CST65(1)***CST65(72), HMC65, ROTAG, H100, H100M, H100Y, HAT, HATM, HATY, HELD, ELSTD, H3NW, H112, H1123, H213, H2134, HVEL, STDB, NSTDB, RNTB, NRNTB, UFC, OFCM
4, OFCY, MOV1M, MOV1Y, MOVNM, MOVNY, CST(1)***CST(7), CASEW, HAG, HPH,
5HREL, HINSB, HINSA, HLOST, HMC, HRAP, HTP, HFEEL, HCRD, HCRDA, RACE,
6INCOM, STD, STD, GRB(1)***GRB(9), GRA(1)***GRA(9), PRB(1)***
7PRB(7), PRA(1)***PRA(7), GRSF(1)***GRSF(9), G*AG(1)***G*AG
8(9), AID(1)***AID(14), PTR(1)***PTR(1), EXP(1)***EXP(18), MBR, PNSTDB(CD+36)=NSTDB*100.*/(NSTDB+STDB)
PNSTDA(CD+36)=NSTDA*100.*/(NSTDA+STDA)
WHENEVER CD=*E999, TRANSFER TO CALC
LOW=H112+H1123+H213+H2134
PHPOOR(CD+36)=LOW*100./H100
HSGSP(CD+36)=HSGSP
SURCH(CD+36)=SURCH
INCOM(CD+36)=INCOM
OFCl(CD+36)=OFCl
PHMC(CD+36)=HMC*100./HAT
PHAG(CD+36)=HAG*100./HAT
PHPH(CD+36)=PHP*100./HAT
PHSREL(CD+36)=HREL*100./HAT
PLOST(CD+36)=HLOST*100./HAT
PHLOST(CD+36)=HLOST*100./HREL
PHELDCD+36)=HELD*100./H100
PNHWN(CD+36)=HNW*100./H100
PNSTDB(CD+36)=NSTDB*100.*/(NSTDB+STDB)
PNSTDA(CD+36)=NSTDA*100.*/(NSTDA+STDA)
PHCRDB(CD+36) = HCRDB*100./HAT
PHCRDA(CD+36) = HCRDA*100./HAT
WHENEVER POP.L.0.1
P=16
OR WHENEVER POP.GE.0.1.AND.POP.L.10.0
P=11
OR POP.GE.10.0.AND.POP.L.25.0
P=12
OR POP.GE.25.0.AND.POP.L.50.0
P=13
OR POP.GE.50.0.AND.POP.L.100.0
P=14
OR E
P=15
END OF CONDITIONAL
TMBRS=MBRS+1.
WHENEVER TMBRS.LE.5.1
I=1
OR WHENEVER TMBRS.LE.10.1
I=2
OR WHENEVER TMBRS.LE.15.1
I=3
OR WHENEVER TMBRS.LE.20.1
I=4
OR WHENEVER TMBRS.LE.25.1
I=5
OR WHENEVER TMBRS.LE.30.1
I=6
OTHERWISE
I=7
END OF CONDITIONAL
W'R T.E.31,J=1
S(I,J)=S(I,J)+1.
SS(I,J)=SS(I,J)+ROTAG
W'R D.E.1
J=2
OR D.E.6.OR.D.E.2
J=3
OR D.E.3
J=4
OR D.E.4
J=5
OR D.E.5.OR.D.E.7
J=6
END OF CONDITIONAL
S(I,J)=S(I,J)+1.
SS(I,J)=SS(I,J)+ROTAG
THROUGH ZZ,FOR VALUES OF Z * D M P T
NTMPD(Z)=NTMPD(Z)+1.
THROUGH LOOPAA,FOR A=1,1,A.G.18
TEXP(Z,EXP(A))=TEXP(Z,EXP(A))+1.
TPTR(Z)=PTR(A)+TPTR(Z)
TMBRS(Z)=TMBRS(Z)+MBRS+1.
TSUR(Z)=TSUR(Z)+SUR
TSURCH(Z)=TSURCH(Z)+SURCH

LOOPAA
TSA1(Z) = TSA1(Z) + SA1
TSA2(Z) = TSA2(Z) + SA2
TSA3(Z) = TSA3(Z) + SA3
THSGSP(Z) = THSGSP(Z) + HSGSP
THROUGH SSS, FOR SR = 1, 1, SR, G, 9
CIRC1
CIRC1
CIRC2
CIRC2
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100E(Z) = TH100E(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100P(Z) = TH100P(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100W(Z) = TH100W(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100C(Z) = TH100C(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100N(Z) = TH100N(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100H(Z) = TH100H(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100G(Z) = TH100G(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100F(Z) = TH100F(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
WHENEVER H112· L· 0, 1, AND · H1123· L· 0, 1, AND · H213· L· 0, 1, AND · H2134· L· 0, 1, TRANSFER TO CIRC3
TH100I(Z) = TH100I(Z) + H100
CONTINUE
THOTP\( (Z) = \text{THOTP} + \text{HOTP} \)

TH64\( (Z) = \text{TH64}(Z) + H64 \)

TH65\( (Z) = \text{TH65}(Z) + H65 \)

THEB64\( (Z) = \text{THEB64}(Z) + \text{HEB64} \)

THEB65\( (Z) = \text{THEB65}(Z) + \text{HEB65} \)

THCO65\( (Z) = \text{THCO65}(Z) + \text{HC065} \)

TAST1\( (Z) = \text{TAST1}(Z) + \text{AST1} \)

TAST2\( (Z) = \text{TAST2}(Z) + \text{AST2} \)

TAST3\( (Z) = \text{TAST3}(Z) + \text{AST3} \)

TH66\( (Z) = \text{TH66}(Z) + H66 \)

TH67\( (Z) = \text{TH67}(Z) + H67 \)

THMC65\( (Z) = \text{THMC65}(Z) + \text{HMC65} \)

TROTAG\( (Z) = \text{TROTAG}(Z) + \text{ROTAG} \)

TOTD\( (Z, D) = \text{TOTD}(Z, D) + 1 \)

TOFC\( (Z) = \text{TOFC}(Z) + \text{OFC} \)

THAG\( (Z) = \text{THAG}(Z) + \text{HAG} \)

THPH\( (Z) = \text{THPH}(Z) + \text{HPH} \)

THSREL\( (Z) = \text{THSREL}(Z) + \text{HSREL} \)

THINSB\( (Z) = \text{THINSB}(Z) + \text{HINSB} \)

THINSA\( (Z) = \text{THINSA}(Z) + \text{HINSA} \)

THLOST\( (Z) = \text{THLOST}(Z) + \text{HLOST} \)

THFEEL\( (Z) = \text{THFEEL}(Z) + \text{HFEEL} \)

THCRDB\( (Z) = \text{THCRDB}(Z) + \text{HCRDB} \)

THCRDA\( (Z) = \text{THCRDA}(Z) + \text{HCRDA} \)

TRACE\( (Z) = \text{TRACE}(Z) + \text{RACE} \)

TINCOM\( (Z) = \text{TINCOM}(Z) + \text{INCOM} \)

THROUGH $E_1$, FOR $E = 1, 1, E, G, 9$

TGRB\( (Z, E) = \text{TGRB}(Z, E) + \text{GRB}(E) \)

TGRA\( (Z, E) = \text{TGRA}(Z, E) + \text{GRA}(E) \)

TGRSF\( (Z, E) = \text{TGRSF}(Z, E) + \text{GRSF}(E) \)

TGRAG\( (Z, E) = \text{TGRAG}(Z, E) + \text{GRAG}(E) \)

$E_4$ CONTINUE

THROUGH $E_3$, FOR $E = 1, 1, E, G, 7$

TPRA\( (Z, 8) = \text{TPRA}(Z, 8) + \text{PRA}(E) \)

TPRB\( (Z, 8) = \text{TPRB}(Z, 8) + \text{PRB}(E) \)

TPRB\( (Z, E) = \text{TPRB}(Z, E) + \text{PRB}(E) \)

TPRA\( (Z, E) = \text{TPRA}(Z, E) + \text{PRA}(E) \)

$E_3$ CONTINUE

TPRB\( (Z, 10) = \text{TPRB}(Z, 10) + \text{PRB}(4) + \text{PRB}(5) + \text{PRB}(6) + \text{PRB}(7) \)

TPRB\( (Z, 9) = \text{TPRB}(Z, 9) + \text{PRB}(3) + \text{PRB}(4) + \text{PRB}(5) + \text{PRB}(6) + \text{PRB}(7) \)

TPRA\( (Z, 9) = \text{TPRA}(Z, 9) + \text{PRA}(3) + \text{PRA}(4) + \text{PRA}(5) + \text{PRA}(6) + \text{PRA}(7) \)

TPRA\( (Z, 10) = \text{TPRA}(Z, 10) + \text{PRA}(4) + \text{PRA}(5) + \text{PRA}(6) + \text{PRA}(7) \)

THROUGH $G_1$, FOR $G = 1, 1, G, 14$

AAA\( (Z, \text{AID}(G)) = \text{AAA}(Z, \text{AID}(G), G) + 1 \)

$G_1$ CONTINUE

WHENEVER $HATY, L, 63, 9, \text{TRANSFER TO CIRZ}$

THAT45\( (Z) = \text{THAT45}(Z) + \text{HAT} \)

MRP45\( (Z) = \text{MRP45}(Z) + 1. \)

CIRZ CONTINUE

WHENEVER $HATY, G, 1, 1, \text{MRP}(Z) = \text{MRP}(Z) + 1. \)

ZZ CONTINUE

PRATT = $\text{PRA}(1) + \text{PRA}(2) + \text{PRA}(3) + \text{PRA}(4) + \text{PRA}(5) + \text{PRA}(6) + \text{PRA}(7) \)

PRBTT = $\text{PRB}(1) + \text{PRB}(2) + \text{PRB}(3) + \text{PRB}(4) + \text{PRB}(5) + \text{PRB}(6) + \text{PRB}(7) \)

PRB20\( (CD+36) = 100 \times (\text{PRB}(3) + \text{PRB}(4) + \text{PRB}(5) + \text{PRB}(6) + \text{PRB}(7)) / \text{PRBTT} \)

PRA20\( (CD+36) = 100 \times (\text{PRA}(3) + \text{PRA}(4) + \text{PRA}(5) + \text{PRA}(6) + \text{PRA}(7)) / \text{PRATT} \)

PRB25\( (CD+36) = 100 \times (\text{PRB}(4) + \text{PRB}(5) + \text{PRB}(6) + \text{PRB}(7)) / \text{PRBTT} \)
\[ PRA_{25}(cd+36) = 100 \times \frac{PRA(4) + PRA(5) + PRA(6) + PRA(7)}{P_{kATT}} \]

\[ PRNTB = \frac{RTNB}{RTNB + NRNTB} \]

\[ INV_{40} = PRNTB \times H_{112} \]

\[ G_{20P} = INV_{40} - GRB(1) \]

\[ INV_{49} = PRNTB \times (H_{1123} + H_{213}) + INV_{40} \]

\[ G_{20P} = G_{20P} + \left( INV_{49} - (GRB(1) + GRB(2)) \right) \]

\[ INV_{67} = PRNTB \times H_{2134} + INV_{49} \]

\[ T_{17PRB} = PRB(1) + PRB(2) + PRB(3) + PRB(4) + PRB(5) + PRB(6) + PRB(7) \]

\[ T_{37PRB} = PRB(3) + PRB(4) + PRB(5) + PRB(6) + PRB(7) \]

WHENEVER \( G_{20P} \leq T_{37PRB} \) AND \( T_{17PRB} \geq 0.1 \)

\[ W = 1 \]

OR WHENEVER \( T_{17PRB} \leq 0.1 \)

\[ W = 2 \]

\[ W = 3 \]

END OF CONDITIONAL

TRANSFER TO LBL(W)

PRINT FORMATT WW,CD

VECTOR VALUES WW=$S2,I3,S2,H*CONSISTENCY TEST OK**$

TRANSFER TO LBL(4)

PRINT FORMATT WWW,CD

VECTOR VALUES WWW=$S2,I3,S2,H*NO DATA FOR CONSISTENCY TEST**$

TRANSFER TO LBL(4)

PRINT FORMATT WWWW,CD

VECTOR VALUES WWWW=$S2,I3,S2,H*FAILED CONSISTENCY TEST**$

WHENEVER \( G_{20P} \cdot G \cdot 0.1 \) AND \( T_{37PRB} \cdot G \cdot 0.1 \), TRANSFER TO LBL(5)

\[ G_{20P} = 0. \]

LBL(5) CONTINUE

THROUGH Z3, FOR VALUES OF Z=T,M,P,D

\[ G_{20P}(Z) = G_{20P}(Z) + G_{20P} \]

RMANIPULATION PER Q*E

\[ M100S1 = 0. \]

WHENEVER H100M.L.O.1 OR HATM.L.O.1, TRANSFER TO H1D

\[ H100D(T) = H100D(T) + 1. \]
\[ H100D(M) = H100D(M) + 1. \]
\[ H100D(P) = H100D(P) + 1. \]
\[ H100D(D) = H100D(D) + 1. \]

\[ W*R HATM.L.H100M \]

\[ R = 1 \]
\[ O*E \]

\[ R = 2 \]

END OF CONDITIONAL

TRANSFER TO LBLA(R)

LBLA(1)

\[ HATM = HATM + 12. \]

\[ HATY = HATY - 1. \]

LBLA(2)

\[ M100S1 = HATM - H100M \]

\[ Y100S = HATY - H100Y \]

\[ Y100S = Y100S * 12. \]

\[ M100S1 = M100S1 + Y100S \]

H1D CONTINUE

\[ M100S(CD+36) = M100S1 \]

THROUGH ADD1, FOR VALUES OF Z=T,M,P,D

\[ M100S(Z) = M100S1 \]

\[ TM100S(Z) = TM100S(Z) + M100S \]
ADD1
CONTINUE
W\'R H100*L*HAT,TRANSFER TO INV
THROUGH ADD2, FOR VALUES OF Z=T,M,P,D
TLS(Z)=(H100-HAT)+TLS(Z)
TLS100(Z)=TLS100(Z)+H100

ADD2
CONTINUE
PLS(CD+36)=(H100-HAT)*(100./H100)
TRANSFER TO CINV

INV
IHAT=IHAT+1.
CONTINUE

CINV
CONTINUE
AC=CST(2)+CST(3)+CST(4)+CST(5)+CST(6)+CST(7)
AC=AC/HAT
W'\R HAC.LE.AC, HAC=AC
POHH=PPPOOR*NOHH
TPOHH(P)=TPOHH(P)+POHH
ELDHH=PP ELD*NOHH
TELHH(P)=TELHH(P)+ELDHH
NWHH=PPNW*NOHH
TNWHH(P)=TNWHH(P)+NWHH
TRANSFER TO READ
RMANIPULATION AFTER Q'E COUNTED

CALC
CONTINUE
THROUGH M1, FOR VALUES OF Z=1,2,3,4,5,6,7,11,12,13,14,15,20,21
1,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31
EXECUTE SUBMD.(TGRB,9,CAT+PCAT,Z)
WHENEVER CAT.E.2
VAL=39.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.3
VAL=49.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.4
VAL=59.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.5
VAL=69.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.6
VAL=79.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.7
VAL=89.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.8
VAL=99.5
INT=20.
O'E
VAL=1.
END OF CONDITIONAL
WHENEVER VAL.L.2.,TRANSFER TO V1
GRBMD(Z)=VAL+PCAT*INT
TRANSFER TO V2

V1
GRBMD(Z)=999.

V2
CONTINUE
EXECUTE SUBMD.(TGRA,9,CAT+PCAT,Z)
WHENEVER CAT.E.2
VAL=39.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.3
VAL=49.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.4
VAL=59.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.5
VAL=69.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.6
VAL=79.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.7
VAL=89.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.8
VAL=99.5
INT=20.
O'E
VAL=1.
END OF CONDITIONAL
WHENEVER VAL.L.2.,TRANSFER TO V3
GRAMD(Z)=VAL+PCAT*INT
TRANSFER TO V4
GRAMD(Z)=999.
V3
V4
CONTINUE
EXECUTE SUBMD.(TGRSF,9,CAT,PCAT,Z)
WHENEVER CAT.E.2
VAL=39.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.3
VAL=49.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.4
VAL=59.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.5
VAL=69.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.6
VAL=79.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.7
VAL=89.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.8
VAL=99.5
INT=20.
O'E
VAL=1.
END OF CONDITIONAL
WHENEVER VAL.L.2.,TRANSFER TO V5
GRSFMD(Z) = VAL + PCAT * INT
TRANSFER TO V6
GRSFMD(Z) = 999.
V5
CONTINUE
EXECUTE SUBMD(TGRAG,9,CAT,PCAT,Z)
WHENEVER CAT.E.2
VAL = 39.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.3
VAL = 49.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.4
VAL = 59.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.5
VAL = 69.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.6
VAL = 79.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.7
VAL = 89.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.8
VAL = 99.5
INT = 20.
O'E
VAL = 1.
END OF CONDITIONAL
WHENEVER VAL.L.2., TRANSFER TO V7
GRAGMD(Z) = VAL + PCAT * INT
TRANSFER TO V8
GRAGMD(Z) = 999.
V7
CONTINUE
EXECUTE SUBMD(TPRB,7,CAT,PCAT,Z)
W'R CAT.E.2
VAL = 9.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.3
VAL = 19.5
INT = 5.
O'R WHENEVER CAT.E.4
VAL = 24.5
INT = 5.
O'R CAT.E.5
VAL = 29.5
INT = 10.
O'R CAT.E.6
VAL = 39.5
INT = 10.
O'E
VAL = 1.
END OF CONDITIONAL
WHENEVER VAL.L.2., TRANSFER TO V9
PRBMD(Z) = VAL + PCAT * INT
TRANSFER TO V10
PRBMD(Z)=999.

V10
CONTINUE
EXECUTE SUBMD.(TPRA,7,CAT,PCAT,Z)
W'RE CAT.E.2
VAL=9.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.3
VAL=19.5
INT=5.
OR WHENEVER CAT.E.4
VAL=24.5
INT=5.
O'R CAT.E.5
VAL=29.5
INT=10.
O'R CAT.E.6
VAL=39.5
INT=10.
O'E
VAL=1.
END OF CONDITIONAL
WHENEVER VAL.L.2.,TRANSFER TO V11
PRAMD(Z)=VAL+PCAT*INT
TRANSFER TO M1

V11
PRAMD(Z)=999.

M1
CONTINUE
TH64(8)=TH64(2)+TH64(3)+TH64(4)+TH64(5)
TH65(8)=TH65(2)+TH65(3)+TH65(4)+TH65(5)
TH66(8)=TH66(2)+TH66(3)+TH66(4)+TH66(5)
TH67(8)=TH67(2)+TH67(3)+TH67(4)+TH67(5)
THCO65(8)=THCO65(2)+THCO65(3)+THCO65(4)+THCO65(5)
THROUGH D1,FOR VALUES
OF D=31,1,6,7,8
WL65(D)=TH65(D)+THCO65(D)
WL66(D)=TH66(D)+TH65(D)*THCO65(D)/TH64(D)
WL67(D)=TH67(D)+TH66(D)*THCO65(D)/TH64(D)
CONTINUE
THROUGH ADD4,FOR VALUES
OF Z=1,2,3,4,5,6,7,11,12,13,14,15(20,121,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,31)
PHEB(Z)=(THEB64(Z)+THEB65(Z))*(100.)/(TH64(Z)+TH65(Z))
PHMC65(Z)=THMC65(Z)*100./THEB65(Z)
THPOOR(Z)=TH112(Z)+TH1123(Z)+TH213(Z)+TH2134(Z)
PHPOOR(Z)=THPOOR(Z)*100./TH100P(Z)
PHEL(D)=THELD(Z)*100./TH100E(Z)
PHN(W,Z)=THNW(Z)*100./TH100N(Z)
PHPR3(Z)=(TH112(Z)+TH1123(Z)+TH213(Z))/TH100P(Z)
EHPR3(Z)=PHPR3(Z)*(TH64(Z)+TH65(Z))
EHLED(Z)=PHEL(D)*(TH64(Z)+TH65(Z))
EHN(V,Z)=PHN(W,Z)*(TH64(Z)+TH65(Z))
PMRP45(Z)=MRP45(Z)*100./MRP(Z)
W=1
VAL=10.
THROUGH KG, FOR VALUES OF K=2,3,4,5,6,7
TCST65(Z+8)=TCST65(Z+8)+TCST65(Z,K)
CH65(1)=TCST65(1,8)/WL65(1)
\[ \text{PHATSM}(Z) = \text{THAT}45(Z) \times 100 / (\text{TH64(Z)} + \text{TH65(Z)}) \]

CONTINUE THROUGH ZZP, FOR VALUES OF Z = 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29

\[ \text{PERP}(Z) = \text{EHPR3(Z)} \times 100 / \text{TPOHH}(Z) \]
\[ \text{PERNW}(Z) = \text{EHNW}(Z) / \text{TNWHH}(Z) \]
\[ \text{PERE}(Z) = \text{EHELD}(Z) / \text{TELHH}(Z) \]

CONTINUE THROUGH TT1, FOR Z = 2, 4, Z G 5

\[ \text{TPEB} = \text{TPEB}(Z) + \text{TPEB}(5) \]
\[ \text{TPMC} = \text{TPMC}(Z) + \text{TPMC}(5) \]

VECTOR VALUES CARDS = 13, 12, F10, 4F5, 0, 3F1, 0, 3F5, 0, 3F6, 0, 4F6, 0, 1F5, 0, F10, 1F4, 0, 4F2, 0, 4F4, 0, 2F2, 0, F4, 0, 1F1, 0, 5F4, 0, 5F4, 0, F10, 1F5, 0, F10, 2F2, 0, 4F2, 0, 1F4, 0, 3F1, 0, 1F2, 0, 1F2, 0, 1F4, 0, 3F1, 0, 2F4, 0, 1F2, 0, 1F4, 0, 1F2, 0, 1F4, 0, 4, 3F3, 1, 12*
PRINT FORMAT C6
V'S C6=$8H1CHART 6
S22,H*ESTIMATED INCIDENCE OF POOR, ELDERLY, AND NON-WHITE HOUSEHOLDS AMONG DISLOCATEES, IN PERCENT OF TOTAL DISPLACEMENT, BY SMSA'S, AND BY CITY, AGGREGATED BY SIZE**$.

PRINT FORMAT CAP3
VECTOR VALUES CAP3=$S29,H*PERCENT POOR*,S19,H*PERCENT ELDERLY 1*,S16,H*PERCENT NON-WHITE**$

THROUGH CT6, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT6,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),PHPOOR(Z),PHELD(Z),PHNW(Z)

1PHNW(Z)
V'S CHT6=$1HO,
4C6,C4,F10.1,S20,F10.1,S20,F10.1*$
PRINT FORMAT C7
VECTOR VALUES C7=$8H1CHART 7 S22,H*ESTIMATED PERCENT OF POPULATION'S POOR, ELDERLY, AND NON-WHITE HOUSEHOLDS DISLOCATED*/S229,H*FOR CITIES AGGREGATED BY POPULATION, AND SMSA'S (NOTE: 3STANDARD FOR POOR HERE IS*/S29,H*HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF LESS THAN 3,000 DOLLARS)**$
PRINT FORMAT CAP3
THROUGH LOOP7, FOR Z=10,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT C7,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),PERP(Z),PERE(Z),PERNW(Z)
LOOP7 CONTINUE
V'S C7=$1HO,
4C6,C4,F10.1,S20,F10.1,S20,F10.1*$
PRINT FORMAT C8
V'S C8=$8H1CHART 8 S22,H*DATA BASE. PERCENT OF THE 10 MOST RECENT PROJECTS' OCCURRING IN 1964 AND 1965*/S29,H*AND 2THE PERCENT OF DISPLACEMENT IN THOSE YEARS ACCOUNTED FOR BY THESE PROJECTS.***/S29,H*PERCENT OF 'MOST RECENT PROJECTS' 4THESE PROJECTS ACCOUNT FOR THIS */S29,H*OCCURRING IN 1964 AND 5THE PERCENT OF DISPLACEMENT IN 1964 AND 1965**$
THROUGH LOOP8, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT8,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),PMRP45(Z),PHATS(Z)
CONTINUE
V'S CHT8=$1HO,
4C6,C4,S20,F10.1,F10.1*$
EXECUTE POUT.
EXECUTE EXIT.
END OF PROGRAM

* MAD

EXTERNAL FUNCTION
PROGRAM COMMON SPELL,AAA,GRBMD,GRAMD,PRBMD,PRAMD,GRSFMD,GRAGMD,1D,HAC,CH65,PHPOOR,PHHELD,PHNW,PHWEL,PNSTDB,PHCRDB,G2OP,PRB20,P2RB25,TSRV,NMPD,AHA,CHH,SMT,PLS,TSUR,TSURCH,TRACE,TINCOM,THF
3EEL,AHMC,PHMC,PP,ARAP,AHOTP,PHAG,PHSREL,PHINSB,P,INSA,PHLOST,4PHCRDA,PNSTDA,WL65,WL66,WL67,TCST65
DIMENSION WL65(36),WL66(36),WL67(36),TCST65(360,EDIM)
DIMENSION SPELL(155,SP),AAA(2160,ADIM),GRBMD(36),GRAMD(36),PRBMD(36),G2OP(36),PRB20(36),PRB25(36),TSRV(2360,EDIM),NMPD(36),AHA(36),CHH(36),SMT(36),PLS(200),TSUR(36)
3,TURCH(36),TRACE(36),TINCOM(36),THFEEL(36),AHMC(36),PP(36),ARAP(36),AHOTP(36),PHINSB(36),PHINSB(36),PHINSB(36),PHINSB(36),PHINSB(36),PHINSB(36)
I

5INSA(36),PHLOST(200),PHCRDA(200),PNSTDA(200)
DIMENSION PHMC(200),PHAG(200),PHSREL(200)
VECTOR VALUES EDIM=2,1,10
VECTOR VALUES SP=2,1,5
VECTOR VALUES ADIM=3,1,4,15
INTEGER Z,SPELL
ENTRY TO POUT.
PRINT FORMAT C9
V'S C9=$8H1CHART 9 S22,H*WORKLOAD BY YEAR, AND BY
1CAUSES OF DISPLACEMENT**$
PRINT FORMAT CAP1
P'T CHT9, WL65(31), WL65(1), WL65(6), WL65(7), WL65(8), WL6
16(31), WL66(1), WL66(6), WL66(7), WL66(8), WL67(31), WL67(1), WL67(6)
2, WL67(7), WL67(8)
VECTOR VALUES CHT9=$5H01965 S25,F10.0,4(S10,F10.0)/,9HOEST
1966 S21,F10.0,4(S10,F10.0)/,9HOEST 1967 S21,F10.0,4(S10,F1
20,0)**$
PRINT FORMAT C10
V'S C10=$9H1CHART 10 S21,H*TOTALS OF PROPERTY TAKEN**$
PRINT FORMAT CAP1
PRINT FORMAT CHT10, TCST65(1,9), TCST65(6,9), TCST69(7,9), TCST65
1(1,1), TCST65(6,1), TCST65(7,1), TCST65(1,2), TCST65(6,2), TCST65(
27,2), TCST65(1,3), TCST65(6,3), TCST65(7,3), TCST65(1,4), TCST65(6
34), TCST65(7,4), TCST65(1,5), TCST65(6,5), TCST65(7,5), TCST65(1,6
4), TCST65(6,6), TCST65(7,6), TCST65(1,7), TCST65(6,7), TCST65(7,7)
VECTOR VALUES CHT10=$7HTOTALS S24,(S10,3(S10,F10.0)/28HUCOM
1PENSATION TAKEN PROPERTY S13,3(S10,F10.0)/24HOMOVING EXPENSE
2PAYMENTS S17,3(S10,F10.0)/29HORELOCATION ADJUSTMENT PAY'TS
3S12,3(S10,F10.0)/29HOOTHER ASSISTANCE PAYING RENT S12,3(S10,
4F10.0)/26HOSALARIES OF REGULAR STAFFS S15,3(S10,F10.0)/25HOSALARY
5RIES OF CASE WORKERS S16,3(S10,F10.0)/27HOOTHER S12,3(S10,
6,F10.0)**$
PRINT FORMAT C11
V'S C11=$9H1CHART 11 S21,H*PERCENT OF POOR, ELDERLY, NON-WHITE, WLFARE, IN NON-STANDARD HOUSING, OVER CROWDED, ESTIMATED POOR**$
PRINT FORMAT CAP1
PRINT FORMAT CHT11, CH65(1), CH65(6), CH65(7)
VECTOR VALUES CHT11=$S49,F10.0,S10,F10.0,S10,F10.0*$
PRINT FORMAT C12
V'S C12=$9H1CHART 12 S21,H*PERFORMANCE NEED*/, 1S29,H*PERCENT OF POOR, ELDERLY, NON-WHITE, WLFARE, IN NON-STANDARD HOUSING, OVER CROWDED, ESTIMATED POOR*/, S29,1*PAYING GREATER THAN 20 PERCENT FOR INCOME IN RELATION TO OVERALL INCOME**, S29,1*PAYING GREATER THAN 20 PERCENT FOR INCOME**, S29
6S*/S29, H*PERCENT OF FAMILIES PAYING GREATER THAN 20 PERCENT FOR INCOME**, S29,1*PAYING GREATER THAN 20 PERCENT FOR INCOME**, S29
7D PHCRD P,G20 ALL,G20 ALL,G25**$
THROUGH LOOP12, FOR Z=1,1,Z,G31
PRINT FORMAT CHT12, SPELL(Z,1), SPELL(Z,5), PHPOOR(Z), PHELD(Z)
1, PHNW(Z), PHWEL(Z), PNSTDB(Z), PHCRDB(Z), G20P(Z), PR20(Z), PR625/
CONTINUE
V'S CHT12=$1H0, 4C6,C4,9(F10.1)$$
PRINT FORMAT C13
V'S C13=$9H1CHART 13 S21,H*PERFORMANCE PROCEDURE
1S*/,S29,H*NUMBER OF AGENCIES OFFERING THE FOLLOWING RELOCATIO
2N SERVICES...*/S29,H* SHORT TERM REFERAL TO FOLLOW MEDI
3CAL RELOC OTHER HOME-M OTHER OTHER TOTA
4L*/,S29,H* COUNSELING SOC WELFARE UP ASSISTANCE ADJ P
5MT RENT ASST COURSES 1-ADDL 2+ADDL AG**$
THROUGH LOOP13, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT13,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),TSRV(1,...TSRV(Z
1,9),NTMPD(Z)

CONTINUE
V'S CHT13=$1H0, 4C6,C4,10(F10.0)$$
PRINT FORMAT C14
VECTOR VALUES C14=$9H1CHART 14 S21,H*PERFORMANCE PROCEDURE
1URES (Z)*///S32,H*TOTAL AVG NO OF COST/HH AVG MOS PC
2T LOST NO DONE NO CHNGS NUMBER COLLECTING DATA*/S31,H*AG
3ENCIES HH AT TKG MR PROJ SURV-TKG SURV-TKG ADV-SURV
4 VIZ SURV BY RACE INCOME FEEL**$
THROUGH LOOP14, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT14,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),NTMPD(Z),AHAT(Z),C
1HH(Z),SMT(Z),PLS(Z),TSUR(Z),TSURCH(Z),TRACE(Z),T)NCOM(Z),THF
2EL(Z)

CONTINUE
V'S CHT14=$1H0, 4C6,C4,10(F10.0)$$
PRINT FORMAT C15
V'S C15=$9H1CHART 15 S21,H*PERFORMANCE REACHING*
1//,S29,H*AVG NO HH PCT HH PROP OF AVG RAP AVG OTH
2ER PCT AGY PCT S PCT INS PCT INS PCT*/S29,H*PAID M C
30S PAID MC POOR ASSTD PAYMENT RENT PMNT REFERRED REL
40C BEFORE AFTER LOST**$
THROUGH LOOP15, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT15,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),AHAT(Z),C
1HH(Z),SMT(Z),PLS(Z),TSUR(Z),TSURCH(Z),TRACE(Z),T)NCOM(Z),THF
2EL(Z)
V'S CHT15=$1H0( 4C6,C4,10(F10.1)$$

CONTINUE
PRINT FORMAT C16
VECTOR VALUES C16=$9H1CHART 16 S21,H*PCT HOUSEHOLDS CROW
1DED BEFORE, AFTER, NON-STANDARD BEFORE, AND AFTER**$
THROUGH LOOP16, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT16,SPELL(Z(1)...SPELL(Z,5),PHCRDB(Z),PHCRDA(Z
1),PNSTDB(Z),PNSTDA(Z)

CONTINUE
V'S CHT16=$1H0, 4C6,C4,10(F10.1)$$
PRINT FORMAT C17
V'S C17=$9H1CHART 17 S21,H*AGENCY REACTIONS TO DIFFERENT FORMS OF ASSISTANCE*/, S38,H*E
1DER**$
THROUGH LP17A, FOR Z=1,1,Z.G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT17A,SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5),AAA(Z,1,1)...AAA(Z
1,8),AAA(Z,2,1)...AAA(Z,2,8),AAA(Z,3,1)...AAA(Z,3,8),AAA(Z
24,1)...AAA(Z,4,8)
LP17A CONTINUE
THROUGH LP17B, FOR (Z =1,1,Z,G.31)
PRINT FORMAT CHT17B, SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5), AAA(Z,1,9)...AAA(Z,1,14), AAA(Z,2,9)...AAA(Z,2,14), AAA(Z,3,9)...AAA(Z,3,14), AAA(Z,4,9)...AAA(Z,4,14)

LP17B CONTINUE
V'S CHT17A=$1HO,4C6,C4, 8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/,S29,8(F10.0)/
V'S CHT17B=$1HO,
4C6,C4,6F10.0/,S29,6F10.0/,S29,6F10.0/,S29,6F10.0/,S29,6F10.0/
PRINT FORMAT C18
V'S C18=$91HO,1CHART 18 S21,H*MEDIAN GROSS RENT(BEFORE AND AFTER),MEDIAN PCT INCOME SPENT ON RENT(BEFORE AND AFTER)*/,529,H
2*MEDIAN GROSS RENT SELF AND AGENCY RELOCATED*/,529,H*G RENT
3B G RENT A
MD PCT B
MD PCT A
GR S
4SELF R GR AGENCY REL**$
THROUGH LOOP18, FOR Z=1,1,Z,G.31
PRINT FORMAT CHT18, SPELL(Z,1)...SPELL(Z,5), GRBMD(Z), GRAMD(Z), 1PRBMD(Z), 1PRAMD(Z), GRSFMD(Z), GRAGMD(Z)
LOOP18 CONTINUE
V'S CHT18=*$1HO,4C6,C4, 2F10.1,510,2F10.1,510,2F10.1*$
PRINT FORMAT AVGC,HAC
V'S AVGC=$44H2HIGHEST COST OF RELOCATION PER HOUSEHOLD = F10
1.0*$
FUNCTION RETURN
END OF FUNCTION

* MAD
EXTERNAL FUNCTION (TAA,NUM,CAT,PCAT,Z)
INTEGER Z,U,NUM,CAT,XX,TEMP
ENTRY TO SUBMD.
TOTAA=0.
THROUGH HA, FOR U=1,1,U,G.NUM
TOTAA=TOTAA+TAA(Z,U)
HA CONTINUE
TOTAA=TOTAA/2.
THROUGH MD, FOR TEMP=1,1,TOTAA.LE.0.
MD TOTAA=TOTAA-TAA(Z,TEMP)
CAT=TEMP
WHENEVER TOTAA.E.0.
XX=1
OTHERWISE
XX=2
END OF CONDITIONAL
TRANSFER TO LAB(XX)
LAB(1)
PCAT=1.
TRANSFER TO LAB(3)
LAB(2)
TOTAA=TOTAA+TAA(Z,CAT)
PCAT=TOTAA/TAA(Z,CAT)
LAB(3) FUNCTION RETURN
END OF FUNCTION
0.1 Name of Agency: 

0.2 Respondent's name: 

0.3 Respondent's title: 

1.1 Staff.

1.11 Title of person in principal charge of residential relocation:

Does above devote full time to relocation? 

If not full time, roughly what percent of time is spent on relocation? 

How long in charge of relocation? 

Experience and/or training of person in principal charge of relocation. (Please check as many as appropriate; double check principal experience and/or training.)

1. welfare department,
2. social work,
3. public health,
4. public housing,
5. public administration,
6. real estate,
7. urban renewal,
8. other (specify)

9. None

1.12 Members of regular relocation staff, other than person in principal charge.

How many such members?

(1) Job description:

Percent of time spent on relocation:

Principal experience and/or training: (Insert relevant number from chart referring to 'person in charge').

If #8 'other', specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>welfare department</td>
<td>welfare department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social work</td>
<td>social work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public health</td>
<td>public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public housing</td>
<td>public housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public administration</td>
<td>public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate</td>
<td>real estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban renewal</td>
<td>urban renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (specify)</td>
<td>other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welfare department</td>
<td>welfare department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social work</td>
<td>social work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public health</td>
<td>public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public housing</td>
<td>public housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public administration</td>
<td>public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate</td>
<td>real estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban renewal</td>
<td>urban renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (specify)</td>
<td>other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) **Job description:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

Percent of time spent on relocation: \[\text{PTR}(3)\]

Principal experience and/or training? (Insert relevant number from chart referring to 'person in charge'): \[\text{EXP}(3)\]

If #8 'other', specify__________

---

(3) **Job description:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

Percent of time spent on relocation: \[\text{PTR}(4)\]

Principal experience and/or training? (Insert relevant number from chart referring to 'person in charge'): \[\text{EXP}(4)\]

If #8 'other', specify__________

---

(4) **Job description:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

Percent of time spent on relocation: \[\text{PTR}(5)\]

Principal experience and/or training? (Insert relevant number from chart referring to 'person in charge'): \[\text{EXP}(5)\]

If #8 'other', specify__________

---

(N) If additional space needed, please attach page.

1.2 Have you ever contracted for special relocation assistance from:

1. settlement house__________ \[\text{SA1}\]
2. planning consultants__________ \[\text{SA2}\]
3. other (specify)__________ \[\text{SA3}\]

---

2. **Relocation surveys.**

2.1 Has your agency or consultant done any surveys of housing conditions and relocation requirements in potential project areas prior to taking?

---

Have any of these surveys resulted in changes in the planning or timing of the displacing project:

---
2.2 How do you determine in advance whether there is adequate public and private housing for relocation?

Public housing:

Private housing:

2.3 Have you ever found the housing supply inadequate in condition, rent, location, or suitability for relocated?

What kinds of steps were taken to correct this.
3. How are households first notified about project? (If you send out an
official letter, please include a copy.)

4. Which of these additional services, if any, are provided?

1. short term counseling for family. ................................ SRV(1)
2. referral to social welfare department. ............................ SRV(2)
3. follow up to see if agency referral is taken ...................... SRV(3)
4. medical assistance and counseling. ................................ SRV(4)
*5. relocation adjustment payments. .................................. SRV(5)
6. other assistance in paying rent. ................................. SRV(6)
7. home-making courses. ................................................ SRV(7)
8. other (specify) ....................................................... SRV(8)

*under Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964.

5. Dislocation and relocation workload.

5.1 How many households were on sites taken in 1964 and
1965 by your displacing activity? Please include single
person households and roomers. 1964. .............. H64
1965. .............. H65

5.2 Of the above households how many did you consider
eligible for your assistance? 1964. .................. HEB64
1965. .................. HEB65

5.3 Did you assist these: (check)

1. one-person households. ............................................ AST1
2. roomers. .............................................................. AST2
3. boarders. ........................................................... AST3

5.4 How many additional households were on your workload in
1965 from takings prior to 1965? ................................. HCO65
5.5 How many households do you anticipate will be on sites taken by your displacing activity in 1966 and 1967?

1966: [H66]
1967: [H67]

5.61 What was your relocation expenditure last year, 1965?

1. compensation for taken property.
2. moving expense payments.
3. relocation adjustment payments.
4. other assistance in paying rent.
5. salaries of regular staff.
6. salaries of case workers specially taken on.
7. other.

(a) under Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964.
(b) for any employee who spent only part time on relocation use only a corresponding portion of his salary.

5.62 How many households received moving expense payments in 1965?

5.7 Have you ever done relocation for another displacing agency?

6. For your most recently completed residential relocation project please provide the following information.

6.0 Name of project: ____________________________
Federal project number: ____________________________ (if applicable)

6.1 What type of displacing activity was involved?

1. urban renewal.
2. streets and highways.
3. code enforcements.
4. public buildings.
5. other (specify).

6.2 Households surveyed.

Number of households, 100% survey?
Date of survey: ____________________________ month. ____________________________ year.

Number of households on site at time of taking?
Date of taking: ____________________________ month. ____________________________ year.
6.2 Continued

In your 100% survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many elderly households? (specify whether standard is 60, 62, or 65)</td>
<td>HELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many non-white households?</td>
<td>HNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many single person households with incomes less than $2,000?</td>
<td>HLI2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $3,000?</td>
<td>HLI23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many two or more person households with incomes less than $3,000?</td>
<td>H213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 to $4,000?</td>
<td>H2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many households with one or more members receiving welfare payments?</td>
<td>HWEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Before relocation how many households were living in standard housing? | STDB |
| sub-standard housing? | NSTDB |

6.4 Before relocation how many were renters? | RNTB |
| Before relocation how many were owners? | RRTB |

6.5 Was a site relocation office established? If so, when?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>month...</td>
<td>OFCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year.....</td>
<td>OFCY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 When did first and last families move out? first?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>month...</td>
<td>MOVLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year.....</td>
<td>MOVLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 Residential relocation costs for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. compensation for taken property</td>
<td>CST(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. moving expense payments</td>
<td>CST(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 3. relocation adjustment payments</td>
<td>CST(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. other assistance in paying rents</td>
<td>CST(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 5. salaries of regular staff</td>
<td>CST(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. salaries of case workers taken on</td>
<td>CST(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. other</td>
<td>CST(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) under Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964.
(b) for any employee who spent part time on this project use only a corresponding portion of his salary.
6.8 In addition to regular staff, how many case workers were taken on for this project? CASEW

6.9 How many households took units referred by agency? HAG
Of these how many were public housing? HPH

How many households were self-relocated? HSHRELL
Of these: How many requested agency inspection before moving? HINSB
How many did agency inspect after the move? HINSA
How many were lost? HLOST

6.10 How many households received:

- moving expenses? HMC
- *relocation adjustment payments? HRAP
- other assistance in paying rent? HOTP

*under Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964.

6.11 Has there been a check to see if relocated households feel that they are better or worse off than before? HFREEL

6.12 How many households had more than one person per room before relocation? HCRDB
after relocation? HCRDA

6.13 Are there records about geographic distribution of relocatees by race? RACE
by income? INCOM

6.14 After relocation how many households were in standard housing? STD
sub-standard housing? NSSTD

6.15 What standards does agency use to determine whether housing is standard or not?
6.16 Gross monthly rent before and after relocation. Renters only.

(Gross rent includes cost of heat and utilities.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Rent Range</th>
<th>Number of Households Before</th>
<th>Number of Households After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 40</td>
<td>GRB(1)</td>
<td>GRA(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>GRB(2)</td>
<td>GRA(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>GRB(3)</td>
<td>GRA(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>GRB(4)</td>
<td>GRA(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>GRB(5)</td>
<td>GRA(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>GRB(6)</td>
<td>GRA(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>GRB(7)</td>
<td>GRA(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-119</td>
<td>GRB(8)</td>
<td>GRA(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-up</td>
<td>GRB(9)</td>
<td>GRA(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.17 Percent of income spent on Gross rent before and after relocation. Renters only.

(Gross rent includes cost of heat and utilities.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>Number of Households Before</th>
<th>Number of Households After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 10</td>
<td>PRB(1)</td>
<td>PRA(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>PRB(2)</td>
<td>PRA(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>PRB(3)</td>
<td>PRA(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>PRB(4)</td>
<td>PRA(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>PRB(5)</td>
<td>PRA(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>PRB(6)</td>
<td>PRA(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-up</td>
<td>PRB(7)</td>
<td>PRA(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.18 Comparison of Gross rent after relocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Gross Monthly</th>
<th>self-relocated</th>
<th>Agency referral not including Public Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 40</td>
<td>GRSF(1)</td>
<td>GAG(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>GRSF(2)</td>
<td>GAG(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>GRSF(3)</td>
<td>GAG(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>GRSF(4)</td>
<td>GAG(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>GRSF(5)</td>
<td>GAG(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>GRSF(6)</td>
<td>GAG(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>GRSF(7)</td>
<td>GAG(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-119</td>
<td>GRSF(8)</td>
<td>GAG(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-up</td>
<td>GRSF(9)</td>
<td>GAG(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please mention two or three aspects of relocation which need attention. For each discuss measures that you think would be helpful.
8. Do you think that the following forms of state assistance would be:

1. very useful
2. useful
3. harmful, or a nuisance
4. no opinion

Please insert appropriate number in space to right of each form of assistance.

a. relocation personnel training programs

b. relocation personnel recruiting programs

c. introduction of a standardized record keeping system, suitable for use in preparing all types or reports.

d. centralized computer service for help in preparation of data for relocation plans and reports.

e. detailed reports on metropolitan area housing supply and demand; especially low income housing supply and demand.

f. information on size of anticipated relocation projects of neighboring cities or towns.

g. a program similar to federal 221 d 3, but applicable to all areas.

h. a short term rent supplement program

i. a long term rent supplement program

j. introduction of standard procedures for relocation assistance

k. introduction of standard criteria and procedures for evaluating relocation housing.

l. regulations permitting taking agency to list dwellings inspected recently, and found standard, by other agencies.

m. provision for your agency to carry out rehabilitation of relocation housing, outside project area.
8. Continued.

n. informal conference to exchange ideas about relocation.

Please comment further on any of the above, if you wish. Also, please suggest other forms of state assistance which you think would be useful to local relocation programs.
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APPENDIX C
### Chart I

**Data Base for Table 4. Percent of the 'Most Recent Projects' Occurring in 1964 and 1965 and the Percent of Displacement in Those Years Accounted for by These Projects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Displacing Activity</th>
<th>Percent of 'Most Recent Projects' Taking in 1964 and 1965</th>
<th>These Projects Account for This Percent of Displacement in 1964 and 1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Public Works</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cities Aggregated By Size**

| Pop. Under 10T               | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Pop. Between 10 and 25T      | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Pop. Between 25 and 50T      | 100.0                                                   | 213.4                                                           |
| Pop. Between 50 and 100T     | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Pop. Over 100T               | 66.7                                                    | 161.1                                                           |

**SMSA's**

| Boston                      | 100.0                                                   | 229.0                                                           |
| Brockton                    | 100.0                                                   | 133.6                                                           |
| Fall River                  | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Fitchburg-Leominster        | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Lawrence-Haverhill          | 50.0                                                    | 64.3                                                            |
| Lowell                      | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| New Bedford                 | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Pittsfield                  | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Springfield-Holyoke-Chicope | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |
| Worcester                   | 0.                                                      | 0.                                                               |

**Grand Total**

| 50.0                                                      | 105.1                                                            |
FOOTNOTES

1. Two agencies known to be active have not submitted their responses at the time of writing: Malden and Worcester Redevelopment Authorities.

2. Workload is estimated on the basis of 'carry-over' factors calculated for 1965 (see 5.4 on questionnaire).

3. Known as Chart 6 in the MAD Program found in Appendix A. Zeros appear in the table when there was no urban renewal activity, or when data was lacking. Single person families are considered poor when income is below $3,000, and two or more person families are considered poor with incomes below $4,000. The standard for elderly head of household was left to the reporting agency. Most agencies chose 62 or 65, some chose 60.

4. Known as Chart 7 in the MAD Program found in Appendix A, where the procedure followed can be traced.

5. The data base for the estimates in Table 4 can be understood by studying the MAD Program in Appendix A, together with Chart I, Appendix C.


8. Ibid.

9. "Family" is used broadly in this section to mean any living group which behaves as a consumer unit, including single persons.


13. Naturally, if this were computed on income before taxes, the percentage would be smaller.


18. Ibid.


20. In New York State, where the Department of Housing reviews in entirety the relocation plans of all renewal projects, the effect of the state review has been to make the regional office of HUD review relocation plans more carefully. (From conversation with Commissioner Edward Bibby, New York State Department of Housing, Division of Urban Affairs.)

21. See bibliography material by Stotz (19), and Meyerson et al (16). Also see section IIA of this paper.

22. One agency, for example, compiled a list of vacancies that appeared in newspaper listings over a period of sixteen weeks. When asked if they followed up to see when an apartment became occupied, it was answered that they never take an apartment off the list because the purpose of the list is to show available housing. They were interested in documenting the turnover rate, and insisted that the vacancy rate was irrelevant.

23. The second stage has not been completed.


26. The procedure can be traced in the MAD Questionnaire Analyzing Program found in Appendix A.

27. More than one person per room.
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