# REPORT

# ON

# CONNECTICUT:

## FAMILY RELOCATION UNDER URBAN RENEWAL



BY THE
CONNECTICUT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE TO THE
UNITED STATES COMMISSION
ON CIVIL RIGHTS

JULY 1963

# FAMILY RELOCATION UNDER URBAN RENEWAL IN CONNECTICUT

## Problems and Proposals in a Typical Federal Government Program Involving Relocation



Report of the Connecticut Advisory Committee
to the
UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
JULY 1963

Members of the Connecticut Advisory Committee

Prof. Louis H. Pollak, Chairman
New Haven

Joseph J. Morrow, Vice Chairman
Stamford

Mrs. Sarah G. Rosenthal, Secretary
Branford

---

Subcommittee I
(on Relocation)

Prof. John D. Maguire, Chairman
Middletown

Frank J. Corbett
Bridgeport

The Reverend Edwin R. Edmonds
New Haven

Hon. Palmer S. McGee
Farmington

Prof. Rex Charlton Neaverson
Hartford

Hon. Robert Satter
Newington

Subcommittee II
(on Apprenticeship Training)

Prof. E. E. Schattschneider, Chairman
Old Saybrook

Hon. Peter Paul Mariani
Groton

Joseph Morrow
Stamford

Mrs. Sarah Rosenthal
Branford

---

Consultants to Subcommittee I

Dr. Henry G. Stetler, Research Director
Connecticut Civil Rights Commission

Robert Feldman

# Preface

This report was submitted to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by the Connecticut Advisory Committee. The Connecticut Committee is one of the 51 Committees established in every State and the District of Columbia by the Commission pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Its membership consists of interested citizens of standing who serve without compensation. Among the functions and responsibilities of the State Advisory Committees, under their mandate from the Commission on Civil Rights, are the following: (1) to advise the Commission of all information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; (2) to advise the Commission as to the effect of the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and (3) to advise the Commission upon matters of mutual concern in the preparation of its final report. The Commission, in turn, has been charged by the Congress to investigate allegations, made in writing and under oath, that citizens are being deprived of the right to vote by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin; to study and collect information regarding legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws; to appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection; and to report to the President and to the Congress its activities, findings, and recommendations.

# Contents

# Introduction

Cities in Connecticut were among the very first to obtain major Federal assistance through the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Urban Renewal Administration when it was formally established in 1949. New Haven and Hartford were rapidly followed by smaller towns like Ansonia and Middletown, so that by July 1962, there were 29 Connecticut municipalities engaged in 63 urban renewal projects, requiring the relocation of 12,949 families. By the summer of 1962, 3,125 of these families had been relocated.[1] By October, principally because of the launching of a comprehensive General Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan in New Haven, the number of families to be displaced had dramatically risen to 20,760. In this period, only 200 additional families were relocated.[2] Overall, enough families had been relocated to obtain a representative sample of their praise or complaints regarding the process. (Indeed, throughout the extensive interviewing described below, only seven families refused to be interviewed.) A growing number awaited relocation, enough to make a critique of the process urgent.

The relocation of individuals and families occurs, of course, not only in connection with urban renewal projects, but also in connection with clearance for public housing, stricter municipal code enforcement, turnpike and highway construction, or the construction of schools, parks, or other community facilities intended to improve a city. However, urban renewal projects have already involved every major Federal housing program and agency and therefore are representative of Federal Government involvement in efforts toward local community improvement. The character and quality of relocation in conjunction with urban renewal projects may therefore be relevant to relocation in connection with these other Federal-local programs. Hence it was relocation accompanying urban renewal projects within our State which subcommittee I of the Connecticut Advisory Committee studied.

A number of recommendations to the United States Commission, to be forwarded by them to the appropriate Federal agencies, have emerged from our study. For convenience sake, all of them are contained in chapter V. In some instances, we suggest changes in the administering of existing policy by the Urban Renewal Administration, either at the local or regional level, to assure nondiscrimination in the relocation of all families. In other instances, we propose basic changes in the policy itself. Wherever there are relevant statutes, directives, or Executive orders bearing on a recommendation, these are also cited, and the texts of these key regulations are found in appendix C. The reader may

wish to refer to the recommendations at the outset of his study of the report.

Each member of the Committee shared the conviction of the 1959 Report of United States Commission on Civil Rights that:[3]

> The most difficult and important test of urban renewal programs is in the relocation of displaced families. This is particularly true with respect to nonwhite families whose mobility is limited not only by virtue of their economic status but also by racial restrictions.

Our unsystematic, impressionistic observations suggested that racially segregated neighborhoods (which bred and reinforced conditions requiring urban renewal) were, in too many instances, being reproduced by relocation in other areas of the city. If relocation were providing the occasion for the recurrence of segregated housing patterns, we wanted to know why, especially since one-fourth of the families involved by October (5,569 of them) were nonwhite.[4] (In a number of States, the percentage of nonwhite families involved is considerably higher.)

We sought to learn from the families who had been relocated the types of assistance received from the relocation offices; the extent of their self-relocation; their satisfaction with the new location and their plans to move or stay; whether they owned their new place or were renting; the racial composition of their neighborhoods before and after relocation; and their satisfaction with the racial composition of their new neighborhood.

The subcommittee used two major instruments for probing these questions: extended interviewing and a weekend conference. (See Acknowledgments.) Two schedules were designed to be administered by interviewers in those five cities within the State having projects involving both the largest total number of families to be displaced and the largest number of nonwhite families to be relocated. (See schedules II and III, appendix B.) These cities are New Haven (12,540 families to be relocated, 3,325 of them nonwhite), Hartford (1,212 families to be relocated, 492 of them nonwhite), Bridgeport (1,148 families to be relocated, 447 of them nonwhite), New Britain (1,205 families to be relocated, 231 of them nonwhite), and Norwalk (403 families to be relocated, 123 of them nonwhite). Projects in these five cities thus involved about three-fourths of all the families in the State to be relocated, about four-fifths of all the nonwhite families involved, and about

nine-tenths of all nonwhite families that had already been relocated at the time we launched our inquiry.[5]

Chapter II, relying heavily on an extended study in the West End of Boston,[6] and other studies outside the State, tells much about the emotions of families facing relocation.

An extended interview schedule for relocation officers was administered to 14 such officials throughout Connecticut. (See schedule I, appendix B.) These 14 cities in which relocation is occurring include approximately three-fourths of the total nonwhite population of Connecticut. Our findings from these interviews, which often differ from the reports of the relocated families which were interviewed, are provided in chapter III.

A representative sample of relocated white and nonwhite families in these five cities was interviewed. Of the 720 already relocated white, Negro, and Puerto Rican families from the five cities in our original sample, 351 were finally interviewed; 142 were Negro, 179 white, and 30 Puerto Rican.[7] (This 49 percent success was quite remarkable in light of the fact that we could not interview 186 families because they were not living at the addresses provided us by the relocation offices; furthermore, our interviews were conducted during January and February 1963, the worst winter in New England in this century!)[8] The stories of these families interviewed are told in figures and comments in chapter IV.[9]

NOTES: INTRODUCTION

1. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Region I, quarterly report, June 30, 1962.

2. Id. Oct. 30, 1962.

3. P. 482.

4. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Region I, quarterly report, Oct. 30, 1962.

5. A city-by-city comparison of the number of families to be displaced with the families already relocated by October 1962 follows:

FAMILIES TO BE DISPLACED AND FAMILIES RELOCATED
IN 14 CONNECTICUT CITIES
(September 1962)

| | Families to be Displaced | | | | Families Relocated | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | White | Nonwhite | | Total | White | Nonwhite | |
| | | | No. | % | | | No. | % |
| Hartford | 1,212 | 720 | 492 | 41 | 533 | 335 | 198 | 37 |
| New Haven | 12,540 | 9,215 | 3,325 | 27 | 1,853 | 1,084 | 769 | 42 |
| Bridgeport | 1,148 | 701 | 447 | 39 | 116 | 57 | 59 | 51 |
| New Britain | 1,205 | 974 | 231 | 19 | 219 | 157 | 62 | 28 |
| Norwalk | 403 | 280 | 123 | 31 | 77 | 52 | 25 | 32 |
| Subtotal | 16,508 | 11,890 | 4,618 | 28 | 2,798 | 1,685 | 1,113 | 40 |

FAMILIES TO BE DISPLACED AND FAMILIES RELOCATED
IN 14 CONNECTICUT CITIES
(September 1962)--continued

| | Families to be Displaced | | | | Families Relocated | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | White | Nonwhite | | Total | White | Nonwhite | |
| | | | No. | % | | | No. | % |
| Stamford | 1,057 | 679 | 378 | 36 | 55 | 19 | 36 | 65 |
| Waterbury | 200 | 155 | 45 | 23 | 114 | 87 | 27 | 24 |
| New London | 514 | 410 | 104 | 20 | - | - | - | - |
| Danbury | 887 | 794 | 93 | 10 | 55 | 19 | 36 | 65 |
| Ansonia | 658 | 484 | 174 | 26 | 117 | 79 | 38 | 32 |
| Middletown | 122 | 87 | 35 | 29 | 122 | 87 | 35 | 29 |
| Meriden | 375 | 305 | 70 | 19 | 16 | 9 | 7 | 44 |
| Norwich | 67 | 48 | 19 | 28 | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| Bristol | 372 | 339 | 33 | 9 | 45 | 38 | 7 | 16 |
| Subtotal | 4,252 | 3,301 | 951 | 22 | 528 | 342 | 186 | 35 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 20,760 | 15,191 | 5,569 | 27 | 3,326 | 2,027 | 1,299 | 39 |

6. Fried, "Grieving for a Lost Home," The Environment of the Metropolis, ed. Leonard J. Duhl (1963) (a report of the West End Research Project of the Boston Center for Community Studies).

7. A word about nomenclature. Sometime analysis uses only white and nonwhite racial categories. The Puerto Ricans are distributed in an unknown proportion between the two categories, although the nonwhite category is predominantly Negro in Connecticut. In this particular analysis dealing with data secured from field interviewing of relocated families, white refers to white respondents but excluding white Puerto Ricans; Negro refers to Negro respondents but excluding Negro Puerto Ricans; Puerto Rican includes all respondents of Puerto Rican origin regardless of color.

8. A town-by-town breakdown of the completed and uncompleted interviews of relocated families follows:

SAMPLE OF RELOCATED FAMILIES SELECTED
FOR INTERVIEWING, January 1963

| | Total | Interviews completed | Interviews not completed | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | Moved | Not home | Refused | Other |
| NEGRO: | | | | | | | |
| Hartford | 120 | 59 | 62 | 44 | 14 | 1 | 3 |
| New Haven | 80 | 32 | 48 | 21 | 17 | 1 | 9 |
| Bridgeport | 70 | 29 | 41 | 20 | 16 | 1 | 4 |
| New Britain | 20 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 6 | - | - |
| Norwalk | 20 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Subtotal | 310 | 142 | 168 | 93 | 54 | 4 | 17 |
| WHITE: | | | | | | | |
| Hartford | 120 | 38 | 82 | 33 | 38 | - | 11 |
| New Haven | 120 | 65 | 55 | 24 | 20 | - | 11 |
| Bridgeport | 90 | 40 | 50 | 31 | 15 | 3 | 1 |
| New Britain | 20 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Norwalk | 30 | 19 | 11 | 4 | 4 | - | 3 |
| Subtotal | 380 | 179 | 201 | 93 | 78 | 3 | 27 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUERTO RICAN: | | | | | | | |
| Hartford | 19 | 19 | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Haven | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bridgeport | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Britain | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Norwalk | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Subtotal | 30 | 30 | - | - | - | - | - |
| GRAND TOTAL | 720 | 351 | 369 | 186 | 132 | 7 | 44 |
| PERCENT | 100% | 49% | 51% | 26% | 18% | 1% | 6% |



9. For social scientists, Dr. Stetler has provided a brief statement on the research problem and procedure in appendix A.

# 1. Background: The Connecticut Situation in National Perspective

The word "relocation" first came into technical use in the mid-1930's when the Public Works Administration started clearing slums to build public housing. Then it meant simply "displacement" forcing people to move so that old buildings could come down to make way for the new.

In the 1930's and 1940's, it had only one purpose: to get people off the site so that construction could begin. There was no requirement to find housing for displaced people, nor to pay moving expenses, although many local authorities waived rent to defray moving expenses and helped the families in many kind and humane ways.

Growing public conscience brought changes. In 1949, the Federal Housing Act set a new goal: Localities must try to relocate families in standard housing and local renewal agencies could pay moving expenses. These changes were regarded as adequate safeguards against hardship; relocation in standard housing with reimbursement for out-of-pocket moving expenses was regarded as an adequate goal.

These changes, however, seemed inadequate to the concerned observers of relocation and certainly unsatisfactory to the people being relocated. Pressures led to the Housing Act of 1954, which converted the notion of urban renewal from mere slum clearance to total community improvement. It required communities seeking Federal assistance to build into their plans strict housing codes and zoning enforcement, a comprehensive community "Workable Program," communitywide citizen participation, a neighborhood-by-neighborhood analysis of blight, and--most important--the provisions of "decent, safe and sanitary housing" for displaced families.[1]

As the 1961 United States Commission on Civil Rights Report and numerous other sources testify, the great difficulty for the Urban Renewal Administration nationally, and for its local relocation officials especially, has been in making this "Workable Program" work. Cities across the country often had weak housing codes laxly enforced. Their preparatory plans for a community program were often altogether inadequate. Often census data and other printed records were used instead of on-the-spot inspections to "analyze" the neighborhood needs and to determine housing supply. The projects themselves were mostly of the clearance, rather than rehabilitation type, and were hastily planned and pushed through. Citizens' planning and action committees frequently

functioned only spasmodically and ineffectively. But the major problems for renewal authorities and their officials seemed to root in the relocation process itself, and to involve racial problems, low incomes, families with many children, and what have come to be called multi-problem families.

Our study confirms in part these relocation problems. The study shows that while only 17 percent of the white families interviewed required "placement" by the LPA (Local Public Agency under whose auspices relocation takes place), 36 percent of the Negro families and 33 percent of the Puerto Ricans required this assistance.[2] Families with no gainfully employed worker required considerably more relocation assistance than those with one or more wage earners.[3] (Families without any gainful worker included those who were receiving welfare aid or social security benefits, and those in which the principal wage earner was either unemployed, disabled, or retired.)

Almost half of the relocated Negro families interviewed (60 of 134) reported families of five or more persons, and three-fourths of the Puerto Ricans interviewed (23 of 30) reported five or more in their families.[4] Clearly, the larger the family, when it is a minority-group family, the greater the assistance required.[5]

Our study disclosed more than these obvious problems. It revealed that, while 60 percent of the whites requiring relocation are 50 years of age or under, 85 percent of all Negroes and 90 percent of all Puerto Ricans requiring relocation are under 50 years of age.[6] Forty-seven percent of the Negro families interviewed were composed of adults, and children 15 years of age or younger, while 67 percent of the Puerto Rican families had this same youthful cast.[7] The comparative youthfulness of the minority-group families involved in relocation seems to support the suggestion that it can be accounted for only by extensive in-migration of such groups to urban centers, and that these recent arrivals gravitate to the most deteriorated housing areas, hence become involved in urban renewal.

As for their training and capacities for employment, 51 percent of the Negro families and 71 percent of the Puerto Rican families reported their gainfully employed family members in semiskilled or unskilled occupations; 36 percent of the Negro families and 26 percent of the Puerto Rican families reported no gainfully employed workers.[8] Indeed, of those who had workers, only 11 percent of the Negroes and 5 percent of the Puerto Ricans were engaged in white-collar occupations.[9]

Without speculating as to causes, it is also clear that the

expectations about improved housing were not high in these families. Although they were informed that the relocation officer could help them, a strikingly high percentage of the families, regardless of racial considerations, did not desire or seek information from the relocation office in regard to different neighborhoods into which they might move. This is the more significant, since those who, on the basis of earlier evidence, needed such assistance most did not ask for it.[10]

Young, minimally skilled, large families centered in areas requiring renewal, displayed little apparent concern about "moving out," and encountered difficulties in moving: this was the picture of the minority-group families revealed by our study. Chapter IV indicates a more complex profile of all the families and their reactions, but this brief sketch suggests the problems confronting relocation officials in Connecticut.

By all reports, Connecticut's situation is not untypical of those elsewhere. The 1961 Report spoke of a "stream of ... poor, ill educated, unadapted, largely nonwhite migrants moving into the central cities and becoming fenced off into older, deteriorating neighborhoods."[11] And Whitney Young, the director of the National Urban League, infers from Department of Commerce figures that "by 1975, 85 percent of all Negro citizens will live in major urban centers, mainly in the North...and unless some way can be found for housing them adequately--especially in connection with urban renewal, slum clearance, and superhighway construction, which will further dislocate them--they face the specter of becoming more segregated, not less segregated, in the unattractive areas of the cities which remain educationally, culturally and socially substandard."[12]

Our study seems to confirm Mr. Young's bleak prophecy. It discloses that such integrated communities (approximately half white, half nonwhite) as existed prior to relocation were rarely preserved during the process and that, more often, a polarization took place, with whites using this opportunity to flee from racially mixed neighborhoods into ones which are either all-white or mostly white in composition, while the overwhelming majority of Negroes ended up being relocated in neighborhoods having 50 percent or more Negroes. (See chapter IV.)

Family relocation in connection with urban renewal in Connecticut is thus probably typical, for better or worse, of programs throughout the Nation. Alterations needed here are likely to be needed elsewhere. Thus, in light of our findings, many of our recommendations suggest concrete ways in which the "Workable Programs" of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can be improved nationally. The statutes and guidelines governing

relocation need to be modified and tightened up, as we indicate, to assure availability of housing sites and of projects adequate to house all displaced families in various parts of the city.

Our findings also suggest the necessity of a shift in mood on the part of local authority officials from one of mere near-compliance with the present minimal standards, sometimes ambiguously phrased, to one of actively utilizing the relocation occasion as an opportunity for achieving a more genuinely diversified, residentially desegregated community. This will require involving the families earlier; placing information about a range of housing possibilities before them (sometimes in spite of their difference); explicitly encouraging and aiding them to move into neighborhoods of their choice; working to prevent a repetition of such segregated housing patterns as formerly existed; continuing communication for a period after these families are resettled; and putting the local social agencies in touch with them when it is clear that additional outside help is needed. Only a sweeping effort to help families fulfill goals, which perhaps they never thought possible, can minimize or nearly eliminate the hurt of relocation.

The Urban Renewal Administration, while hardly the sole force at work in this process, does play a crucial and principal role. And a shift in mood affecting the planning and execution of its policy is required if this desirable residential diversity, now too often lost, is to be realized. The URA must move to prevent discrimination at the time of relocation. Our experience shows that unless the local authority actively promotes desegregation at the time of relocation, it will inevitably perpetuate further residential segregation. This calls for a rigorously executed positive policy of diversity by design. Otherwise, the physical renewal that Federal programs bring to the city may produce further human blight in the lives of low income nonwhite families. And should this happen, the recent observation of Howard Moody will prove true:[13]

> A city is dying when it has an eye for real estate value but has lost its heart for personal values, when it has an understanding of traffic flow but little concern about the flow of human beings, when we have increasing competence in building but less and less time for housing and ethical codes, when human values are absent at the heart of the city's decision making, planning, and the execution of its plans in processes like relocation--then the city dies and all that is left, humanly, is decay.

NOTES: CHAPTER I

1. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Program for Community Improvement (Workable Program) (1960).

2. An indication of the representative character of our sample may be seen by comparing our interview results with the percentages reflected in the January 31, 1963, LPA reports to the Urban Renewal Administration from the same five cities. The proportion of families who said that they were "self-relocated" is in substantial agreement with data available in the records of the LPA to the effect that 73 percent of the whites and 68 percent of the nonwhites relocated themselves. The higher proportion of "self-relocations" in our study results in part from our grouping of home purchasers and renters whereas the LPA records refer only to self-relocation of rental families. In fact, our study reveals that 90 percent of the home purchasers, whether white or Negro, were self-relocated. On the whole, the consistency between our data and the LPA records is indicative of the representativeness of our sample. The LPA reports follow:

CHARACTERISTICS OF RELOCATED FAMILIES IN RECENT URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN 5 CITIES (HARTFORD, NEW HAVEN, BRIDGEPORT, NEW BRITAIN, AND NORWALK) FROM WHICH FAMILIES TO BE INTERVIEWED WERE SELECTED

(Source: LPA reports for January 31, 1963)

| | Number of families | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Families relocated | 2005 | 100 |
| White | 1257 | 63 |
| Nonwhite | 748 | 37 |
| Families relocated in standard private rental housing | 1184 | 100 |
| White | 738 | 62 |
| Nonwhite | 446 | 38 |
| White | 738 | 100 |
| LPA referred | 199 | 27 |
| Self-relocated | 539 | 73 |
| Nonwhite | 446 | 100 |
| LPA referred | 143 | 32 |
| Self-relocated | 303 | 68 |
| Families relocated in sales housing | 289 | 100 |
| White | 258 | 89 |
| Nonwhite | 31 | 11 |
| Families relocated in public housing | 264 | 100 |
| White | 116 | 44 |
| Nonwhite | 148 | 56 |
| Families self-relocated in sub-standard housing, refused aid (4 cities only) | 192 | 100 |
| White | 82 | 43 |
| Nonwhite | 110 | 57 |
| Individuals relocated (4 cities only) | 250 | 100 |
| White | 128 | 51 |
| Nonwhite | 122 | 49 |

3. SELF-RELOCATION--GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT OF FAMILIES

| | Families having one or more wage earner | Families with no gainful worker |
|---|---|---|
| White: | (109) | (43) |
| Self-relocated | 86% | 72% |
| IPA relocated | 14 | 28 |
| Negro: | (81) | (46) |
| Self-relocated | 70% | 54% |
| IPA relocated | 30 | 46 |
| Puerto Rican | (20) | (7) |
| Self-relocated | 80% | 43% |
| IPA relocated | 20 | 57 |

4. SIZE OF FAMILY

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 person | 13% | 10% | 3% |
| 2 - 4 persons | 63 | 45 | 20 |
| 2 persons | 29 | 23 | 10 |
| 3 persons | 18 | 12 | 3 |
| 4 persons | 16 | 10 | 7 |
| 5 - 7 persons | 22 | 34 | 57 |
| 5 persons | 10 | 16 | 13 |
| 6 persons | 8 | 8 | 24 |
| 7 persons | 4 | 10 | 20 |
| 8 or more persons | 2 | 11 | 20 |
| 8 persons | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| 9 or more persons | - | 4 | 10 |

5. SELF-RELOCATION, BY SIZE OF FAMILY

| | All families | Size of family: 1 person | 2 - 4 persons | 5 - 8 persons | 8 or more persons |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White: | (174) | (23) | (110) | (38) | (3) |
| Self-relocated | 83% | 65% | 85% | 89% | 33% |
| LPA relocated | 17 | 35 | 15 | 11 | 67 |
| Negro: | (134) | (14) | (60) | (46) | (14) |
| Self-relocated | 64% | 71% | 70% | 59% | 57% |
| LPA relocated | 36 | 29 | 30 | 41 | 43 |
| Puerto Rican: | (30) | (1) | (6) | (17) | (6) |
| Self-relocated | 67% | -% | 83% | 59% | 83% |
| LPA relocated | 33 | 100 | 17 | 41 | 17 |

6. AGE OF RESPONDENT (ESTIMATED)

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under 35 | 14% | 37% | 43% |
| 35 to 50 | 46 | 48 | 47 |
| Over 50 | 40 | 15 | 10 |

7. COMPOSITION OF FAMILY

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adults only | 51% | 36% | 13% |
| Adults and children 16 - 20 | 12 | 8 | 10 |
| Adults and children under 16 | 27 | 47 | 67 |
| Adults and children of all ages | 10 | 9 | 10 |

8. OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Families having one or more wage earner | 72% | 64% | 74% |
| Professional | 1 | 2 | - |
| Proprietary, managerial | 6 | - | 3 |
| Clerical | 7 | 5 | - |
| Skilled | 17 | 6 | - |
| Semi-skilled | 20 | 18 | 15 |
| Unskilled | 21 | 33 | 56 |
| Families with no gainful worker | 28% | 36% | 26% |
| Welfare or Social Security | 8 | 24 | 19 |
| Unemployed | 1 | 7 | 4 |
| Disabled or retired | 19 | 5 | 3 |

9. PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION IN FAMILIES HAVING ONE OR MORE WAGE EARNERS

| | White (111) | Negro (82) | P.R. (20) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Professional | 2% | 4% | -% |
| Proprietary, managerial | 8 | - | 5 |
| Clerical | 10 | 7 | - |
| Skilled | 23 | 10 | - |
| Semi-skilled | 28 | 28 | 20 |
| Unskilled | 29 | 51 | 75 |

10. RESPONSES TO QUESTION, "DID YOU WANT THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE TO GIVE YOU INFORMATION ABOUT SEVERAL NEIGHBORHOODS?"

| | Self-Relocated Families | | | LPA Relocated | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White (147) | Negro (90) | P.R. (20) | White (30) | Negro (50) | P.R. (10) |
| Yes | 16% | 29% | 35% | 33% | 40% | 30% |
| No | 75 | 62 | 35 | 47 | 54 | 50 |
| Don't know | 9 | 9 | 30 | 20 | 6 | 20 |

11. 4, 1961 Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Housing 81.

12. Young, Whitney M., Jr., "What Lies Ahead?" (an address delivered before the Sixth Annual Convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, September 27, 1962, Birmingham, Ala.).

13. Moody, The City: Metropolis or New Jerusalem? (1963).

# 2. How Families on the Verge of Relocation View the Process

What kinds of hopes and fears do families about to be relocated experience? The schedule prepared for interviewing a representative sample of these families probed for answers to these questions by inquiring of such families their hopes for the neighborhood into which they might move--its physical relation to shops, schools, and to the downtown area, its racial composition, and the kinds of dwellings it would contain. The schedule further inquired of the families their own appraisal of their needs and the degree and kinds of assistance they expected from the relocation office. (See schedule II in appendix B.)

Unfortunately, the interviews could not be conducted. The reasons for this failure are, however, significant for this report. Relocation offices, when asked for a list of families about to be relocated (from which a sample could be drawn), could not provide one. Various explanations were offered. As soon as a project is announced, it was pointed out, the mobile, motivated families rapidly move out, relocating themselves. This occurs so swiftly in the wake of the public announcement that it is time wasted to attempt keeping accurate records on all the families involved from the outset. A list could be provided, it was explained, of those "problem families" still remaining in projects already launched, but their responses would hardly provide a representative picture of outlooks prior to relocation.

This inability to find a cross section of pre-relocatees led the subcommittee to abandon this portion of its interviewing, and to rely on the recollections of families most recently relocated about their prior expectations. It left the subcommittee, however, with many serious questions.

In theory, Federal urban renewal grants are awarded only to those communities which have already assessed the housing demands of displacees and have determined that adequate rehousing is available. But how can such determinations be made without earlier and more direct contact with the families than is suggested by the inability of relocation offices to provide lists of families to be relocated? In spite of URA policy there is little evidence of any initial discussion with families about relocation preferences or needs. Yet, how can a rational search for new housing be conducted without this prior information? Further, many of the families involved need social service assistance in addition to housing aid. Without contacting all families at the commencement of the renewal project, the LPA can hardly assess the

social needs of the families involved, and is unlikely to put them in touch with the community's social agencies. Surely the Urban Renewal Administration should consider requiring this kind of initial contact.

Some of our evidence suggests that the relocation office performs only a minimal function, informing those families who linger of housing vacancies in the city's existing supply and urging them to accept this rehousing, without regard to its condition.

We found that at least two Connecticut communities had listed public housing as a principal rehousing resource for low-income site families. Ample proof was provided by extrapolating the annual vacancy rate in the Federal low rent and State moderate rent projects. In one of these cities, there were over 500 vacancies altogether at the time the survey of the housing supply was made. That number more than satisfied the requirement of the Workable Program. In no instance, however, was there any evidence that "eligible" site families were asked about their feelings regarding public housing occupancy. Moreover, no exploration was made to learn whether there were factors which would exclude some of the families from eligibility. Once the project had begun, relocation officials discovered that some of the "eligible" families had been evicted from public housing and, therefore, were in fact ineligible. Other families who desired public housing units were excluded because of illegitimate children. Still others simply rejected public housing.

Relocation officials in one Connecticut city encountered among site families considerable resistance to public housing as a rehousing resource. In each instance, public housing units were an improvement over the site quarters in which the families were living. Yet the opportunity for improvement was refused for one reason: the stigma attached to public housing in that community. The popular image of public housing--very much a reality in that community--was that it is marked by inferior architecture; that it is inhabited by people who are inferior, precisely because they live there or receive public assistance, or because the projects are rife with crime and muggings, or overseen by tight-fisted managers. The poorest kind of tenant-management relations with the concomitant low tenant morale actually existed; extremely poor living standards prevailed; brusque treatment of tenants by public housing employees was common; exposure of children to clearly antisocial behavior by adults was frequent--all of these conditions were commonly cited as bases for objections to public housing.

The relocation officials, under considerable pressure to clear the site of families, and frustrated in the effort to place

them in public housing, merely shifted many of the unattended hard core social problem families from one section of the city to another already burdened with problems, and accelerated the trend toward racially segregated neighborhoods and schools.

Some of the conditions which served to eliminate public housing as a resource in that particular community were described in detail in a report by a volunteer citizens group in that city. As part of its conclusion the report stated:

> Several activities are underway to give (community named) the "face lifting" it has needed for a long time. Notable among these activities are the urban renewal program and the movement to overcome the serious lags in public education. The success of these activities will depend in substantial degree upon the efficiency with which public housing operates in the future....This suggests that .... the Redevelopment Agency...will have to help bring about needed reforms in local public housing administration....

It should be noted that relocation officials in Connecticut seemed to contact the families involved, when they were finally reached, on a personal basis more adequately than their colleagues elsewhere have formerly done.

The frequently cited study by H. W. Reynolds of relocation practices in 41 cities from 1955 through 1958 disclosed that in 14 of these cities accounting for 65 percent of all the relocations, families to be relocated received no other official information about their displacement except handbills announcing the demolition dates. Rarely was information given about standards for suitability of housing, how new housing could be found, what rents ought to be paid in relation to income, or, what preparations were necessary for moving.[1]

In contrast, 66 percent of the 351 recently relocated families interviewed in Connecticut indicated that they were notified by a visit from "the relocation man" that they would have to move. To be sure, about one-fourth of them were notified by letter, but it was addressed to them personally.[2] This surely is an initial step in the right direction, one which would become far more significant if it were taken earlier and included more considerations of the families' needs than housing alone. We do not assume here that the relocation office should solve all the nonhousing needs, but rather that it should inventory them.

The striking fact which emerged from the interviewing which was completed is that a large number of families faced with relocation "don't want to talk about it." Forty-three percent of

the recently relocated whites interviewed, 50 percent of the Negroes, and 28 percent of the Puerto Ricans, frankly acknowledged seeking no information from any source about schools, churches, stores, transportation or anything else in relation to the new neighborhood into which they might move.[3] Further, as noted in chapter I, only 20 percent of the whites, 32 percent of the Negroes, and 33 percent of the Puerto Ricans wanted any information from the relocation official about alternative neighborhoods into which they might move.

While this fact might suggest a total lack of interest, Marc Fried, on the basis of his 4 year study of relocation in the West End of Boston,[4] is certain that it reflects the deep disturbance which many displaced families feel, a "grief" which numbs them into silence. Interviewing families before and after relocation, he discovered feelings of painful loss experienced prior to displacement and persisting as long as 2 years after relocation.

To be sure, he discovered that the severity of this grief-indignation reaction depends on prior orientation to the project area. The longer an individual lived in the area, the wider his range of associations there, the deeper his commitment to it, the more severe was his grief upon having to move.

Although they rarely verbalize their relation to their home, people to be relocated--especially working class people--attach enormous importance to it as, what Fried calls, "a center of their spatial and social arrangements" so that being required to move is a highly disruptive and disturbing experience for them, even when the home being left is, by any standards, in a slum neighborhood.

Fried's findings reinforce our other bits of evidence. They all suggest that families living in a renewal area ought to be informed much earlier and much more extensively than at present of the impending project. Only this kind of information and "education" as to what is afoot, can avert the panic which often leads them to run for new housing which is often substandard, unsafe, and for which they frequently pay higher rents.

Wherever possible, rehabilitation renewal should be considered. When dislocation and relocation are unavoidable, the project planners might well consider providing for the families to move within their former residential areas during and after renewal. When new areas must be utilized, the possibilities of assimilating them to former patterns of the relocatees' "style" ought to be explored. Chapter V suggests concrete ways in which this might be accomplished.

NOTES: CHAPTER II

1. Reynolds, "The Human Element in Urban Renewal," Public Welfare, April 1961 (a University of Southern California study).

2. The ways in which they were notified:

HOW WERE YOU NOTIFIED, BY THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE, THAT YOU WOULD HAVE TO MOVE?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| By letter | 26% | 24% | 23% |
| A telephone call | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| A visit from the relocation man | 68 | 67 | 63 |
| Some other way (unspecified) | 5 | 4 | 7 |
| Don't know | 10 | 9 | 3 |

3. The responses regarding kinds of information sought:

DID YOU WANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE FOLLOWING (FROM ANY SOURCE)?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| The school situation | 18% | 28% | 38% |
| The location of churches | 26 | 22 | 38 |
| Where the colored and white people lived | 16 | 12 | 7 |
| The location of stores and shopping centers | 26 | 24 | 34 |
| Transportation | 19 | 22 | 28 |
| Anything else | 2 | - | 3 |
| Don't know | 8 | 6 | 17 |
| No response | 43 | 50 | 28 |

4. Fried, op. cit. supra note 6, at 7.

# 3. Relocation Officials: How They Function and How They Regard Their Role

The job of the Local Public Agency relocation official is at best a difficult one. He must be, among other things, an administrator, a negotiator, real estate agent, social worker, loan arranger, adviser, and government agent. One individual can hardly do equal justice to all these responsibilities--particularly since relocation officers are rarely well paid. Facing multiple demands and only ordinary pay, the officer is also responsible to the LPA's executive director, who, even more than the relocation officer, is also beholden to many "publics." LPA officials must be sensative and politically alert in order to meet both the requirements and standards of the HHFA regional offices[1] and at the same time satisfy the wishes or demands of the governing forces in the local community.

The objectives for the relocation officer's task are set out by the HHFA as follows:[2]

(1) Families displaced by a Title 1 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 location.

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

In order to learn more precisely what relocation officers do, an interview schedule was devised and 14 relocation officials throughout Connecticut were interviewed. (See schedule I, appendix B.) These 14 cities included all the major cities currently involved in federally financed urban renewal projects. Because only 14 interviews were involved, no detailed statistical analysis was made. However, several telling trends clearly ran through the responses of the group interviewed.

In almost all instances the LPA executive director was present at the interview and gave most of the responses involving general policy decisions. One gains the distinct impression that, while the relocation officer may do the day-to-day job in the project area, it is the executive director who actually sets down the relocation policy for the specific LPA. Consequently, the references made in this chapter to the relocation officer may be as validly applied to the local executive director. This chapter also draws upon material gathered at the weekend conference of

urban renewal officials held at Wesleyan University. (See Acknowledgments.)

Responses to queries made during the interview of all LPA officials regarding the characteristics of the families involved in relocation were almost identical. This suggests that, while the details of each community may vary, the basic problems of all of them are quite similar. Ironically, examples of relocation difficulties thought by various officials to be unique resolved themselves into certain major types of problems.

A minimal conclusion to be drawn from the similarity of relocation problems is that the major policy changes and innovations we suggest may well be appropriate in virtually all communities currently in the renewal process.

When the LPA officials were asked to explain how they viewed the goals of their jobs in relation to their communities, all of them answered in terms which seemed to be paraphrases of the objectives of the official HHFA relocation outline.[3] When asked about their views on using relocations as a device to achieve further residential desegregation, almost all the officials replied that such an activity, i.e., "integration," was neither their responsibility nor within their authority. Only in isolated instances, however, did any official feel that present ethnic or racial alignments ought to be maintained. Generally, these isolated instances involved elderly people accustomed to a way of life which it would be virtually impossible for them to alter.

In view of the LPA officials' rather neutral position on relocation as a device for creating and maintaining residential diversity, it is interesting to note the resulting racial composition of neighborhoods into which LPA relocated families have moved. (See chapter IV.) It is striking that a far smaller percentage of LPA relocated families ended up in racially segregated neighborhoods than did families who relocated themselves.

The LPA officials were asked if racial or ethnic clustering had occurred as a result of relocation. All answered that only minor clustering had resulted. This response is supported only if the self-relocatees are eliminated from consideration. Under the present system it is not altogether just to blame LPA officials for racial clustering by self-relocatees, but this fact does raise the question of what policy changes can be adopted to avoid it, insofar as possible, and the relocation officer's role in such an altered situation.

The heart of the present policy problem is that families to be relocated enter the relocation officer's workload only after

the LPA, or another public body, has acquired the subject property.[4] By this time, however, most of the families involved have become aware that they must move quickly. Panic often ensues, for the pressure to move before the building is taken becomes great. There is anxiety, fear, and lack of understanding regarding the entire urban renewal concept and the specific program. When the LPA does finally start to work with the families to be relocated, it is often too late to start an adequate educational program about the rights and opportunities open to these families on the renewal site. It is evident that some provision must be made to launch at least the information-sharing aspect of the relocation process considerably before the current entrance into the LPA workload.

Relocation officials often confided that the concrete needs of the families to be relocated are rarely determined in advance of a project, but insisted that this resulted in part from the failure of the LPA to include them early enough in overall project planning.

They also acknowledged that home-finding and rehousing were, at present, largely unplanned operations, totally dependent on "naturally developing" vacancies in the city's existing supply.

Another weakness in the present situation emerged: The current staffing of most LPA's does not include personnel trained in meeting the problems unearthed in the course of relocation and dealing with them in a manner consistent with the goals of urban renewal. In all interviews except one, the LPA officials lamented the lack of adequate facilities and personnel for dealing with the manifest social problems. Most relocation officers stated that they would and did do whatever they could to ease or solve a pressing problem, but that any larger personal involvement would be destructive of their main task--physical relocation. Many of the officials interviewed said, in effect, "The relocation officer is not a social worker; nor should he become one." The interviewer repeatedly heard this refrain. Yet it is essential to analyze the needs of problem families and to see that they are put in touch with the proper social agencies, and this must be done in connection with the relocation process, and at its heart.[5]

In summary, the subcommittee has found that the LPA officials are, for the most part, struggling to do a satisfactory job, but that their guidelines and supports are woefully deficient. These gaps must be closed, as our recommendations in chapter V suggest.

NOTES: CHAPTER III

1. Urban Renewal Administration, HHFA, Urban Renewal Manual: Policies and Requirements for Local Public Agencies, pt. 16, Relocation.

2. Id. sec. 16-1.

3. Urban Renewal Administration, HHFA, op. cit. supra note 1.

4. Id. sec. 16-3-1.

5. In fact it is URA policy to encourage and authorize the hiring of staff to coordinate social services available to displaced families.

# 4. What Happens to Relocated Families

What happens to the families who have gone through the relocation process? This very general and deceptively simple question may well be the most vital and the most sensitive matter in the urban renewal program of any community. A family currently residing in a dwelling which must be evacuated because of renewal site-clearance or rehabilitation has, within its means, the freedom of action or movement that characterizes our society. Such a family is under no obligation to make use of the Local Public Agency's relocation service, and, as indicated in chapter III, many families do not use this service. The first question asked of relocated families was whether they had "found their own apartment or house or whether a representative of the relocation office (LPA) had found it for them." An unusually high proportion of the respondents, 83 percent of the whites, 64 percent of the Negroes, and 67 percent of the Puerto Ricans said that they had relocated themselves.[1]

The significance of the high self-relocation rate is that there can be no "grand design" made and enforced for new residential patterns resulting from urban renewal. This maximum freedom of choice is most desirable. However, it is also true that several aspects of the currently critical urban crises may in fact be worsened by residential patterns which result from panicky self-relocation. To retain freedom of action while achieving some of the goals of an integrated community is at best a difficult task, but the importance of the task surely makes it worth attempting.

Since urban redevelopment in the larger metropolitan centers often involves the displacement of substantial numbers of nonwhite families living in segregated neighborhoods, the neighborhood patterns which emerge after relocation merit close observation. It is important to determine whether urban renewal produces any changes in the direction of breaking down the segregated pattern of nonwhite housing. This is of vital importance for the future of persons residing in these areas because of the now accepted belief that even de facto segregation can have adverse psychological and sociological effects upon nonwhite families. Also, residential segregation almost inevitably brings with it de facto segregation in schools and community life.

Thus we sought to determine the type of neighborhood racial pattern which emerges after relocation. To this end, we asked each respondent to tell us what the racial composition of his neighborhood had been before redevelopment and relocation and what the racial composition of his present neighborhood is after

relocation. Each respondent was asked to classify the before and after neighborhoods in one of five alternative categories: all-white, mostly white, half-white and half-Negro, mostly Negro, or all-Negro.

Among our white respondents, we found that one-half were now living in all-white neighborhoods, compared with only one-fifth prior to relocation. The proportion of white families living in half-white and half-Negro neighborhoods was cut in half (from 29 percent down to 16 percent), and only 2 percent were now residing in mostly Negro neighborhoods in comparison with 19 percent prior to relocation. Thus there seems to be little doubt about the flight of white families into all-white neighborhoods after relocation.[2]

Since we noted earlier that a majority of our families were "self-relocated," a circumstance which involves some degree of choice in regard to neighborhood (though unquestionably a more limited range of choice where nonwhites are involved), the subcommittee felt that more detailed analysis of neighborhood changes according to whether the families were self-relocated or LPA relocated might disclose some interesting differences.

Among whites who were self-relocated, the flight to all-white neighborhoods is even more pronounced (57 percent after, and 23 percent before relocation). Only one percent of self-relocated whites wound up in mostly Negro neighborhoods.[3] On the other hand, among LPA relocated whites, the proportion residing in all-white neighborhoods after relocation was virtually the same as prior to relocation (18 percent and 17 percent, respectively). The greatest change occurred among whites in mostly Negro neighborhoods, which dropped from 28 percent to 7 percent, though still in excess of the proportion of self-relocated whites who moved into this type of neighborhood.[4]

It would appear that the relocated white family, even though it possesses the relatively limited economic means characteristic of those displaced from a redeveloped area, tends to gravitate toward all-white or predominantly white neighborhoods when left to its own devices (self-relocation). Being white equips them, of course, with an immensely greater freedom of choice, because of race, in regard to the racial character of the new neighborhood.

The neighborhood pattern of Negro respondents after relocation presents an entirely different picture. The changes are in fact minor compared with those of whites. There was an increase of families moving into mostly white neighborhoods from (12 to 21 percent), accompanied by an equivalent reduction in families leaving half-white, half-Negro neighborhoods (49 percent to 41 percent). However, the proportion of Negro families living in mostly Negro or

all-Negro neighborhoods remained at 38 percent--virtually the same percentage which had been living in this type of neighborhood prior to relocation.[5] Apart from a shift of 9 percent of the Negro families into mostly white neighborhoods, their neighborhood pattern showed relatively little change after relocation in comparison with whites.

On the other hand, among self-relocated Negro families there appears to be some degree of polarization in regard to the racial character of the neighborhood after relocation. Negro families in mostly white neighborhoods increased from 32 to 40 percent in those Negro families who entered mostly Negro neighborhoods. This increase in both directions, toward mostly white and mostly Negro neighborhoods, was at the expense of neighborhoods having half-white and half-Negro composition (reduced from 49 to 35 percent).[6] Among those Negro families relocated by the LPA, there appears to be a similar movement toward mostly white neighborhoods (from 21 to 27 percent) but accompanied by an actual reduction in the proportion of Negro families living in all-Negro or predominantly Negro neighborhoods.[7]

We are thus confronted with a situation in which it appears that the Negro family when left to his own devices tends to gravitate more toward the predominantly Negro neighborhood than when it is relocated by the LPA.[8] However, the Negro family does not possess the same freedom of choice in selecting a new neighborhood as the white family. In addition to the primary limitation of racial status, there is often a second limitation of economic status.

An inquiry more in depth than the present study would be required in order to determine what proportion of Negro families--apart from limitations because of economic and racial factors--choose to move into predominantly Negro neighborhoods because of a racially motivated choice similar to that of the whites who gravitate toward predominantly white neighborhoods. From the evidence available in our comparison of self-relocated and LPA-relocated Negro families, it would appear that self-relocated, more frequently than LPA relocation, leads them to predominantly Negro neighborhoods.

The limitations on freedom of neighborhood choice among Negro families are further illustrated in the replies to our next question, "In regard to the race of the people who live here, is this neighborhood the kind you wanted to move into?" While 71 percent of the whites said they were satisfied, only 52 percent of the Negroes voiced similar satisfaction.[9] And among Negro families, the amount of dissatisfaction seems to be greater among LPA relocated than self-relocated families.[10] A noteworthy aspect of

satisfaction with the racial character of the neighborhood is revealed when we compare replies to this question among respondents living in different types of neighborhoods.[11] White respondents voiced increasing dissatisfaction as we proceed from residence in all-white to residence in mostly Negro neighborhoods (from 1 percent to 50 percent). And a similar trend is noticeable among Negro respondents who also voiced increasing dissatisfaction as we proceed from residence in mostly white to residence in all-Negro neighborhoods (from 11 percent to 33 percent). This trend among relocated Negro families probably reflects increasing dissatisfaction with the whole complex of physical and psychological deterioration that usually characterizes segregated non-white neighborhoods.

The dissatisfaction felt by minority groups with their new homes is echoed in other statistics gathered by the subcommittee.

In response to the question, "Are you planning to live here awhile, or do you want to move as soon as you can find another place?" we found that white families were most satisfied (72 percent), Negro families were less well satisfied (58 percent), and Puerto Rican families were least satisfied (50 percent) with their new location.[12] It is worth noting that white families who planned to stay in their present location were most satisfied, if they were living in all-white or mostly white neighborhoods, and least satisfied if they were living in neighborhoods having 50 or more percent Negroes. On the other hand, Negro families who planned to stay in their new location were more satisfied (69 percent), if they were living in neighborhoods that were half-Negro and half-white, and least satisfied in all-Negro neighborhoods.[13]

One can surmise that this large-scale dissatisfaction with the new neighborhood will probably prove harmful to the development of community roots, ties, and participation. It may breed a careless approach to new dwellings, local schools, etc., which might be more typical of a transient area than a supposedly permanent residential neighborhood. In many instances it may be said that one result of relocation is to introduce a new transient population into the community.

In response to criticism of its earlier policy--of encouraging wholesale demolition and site clearance--the Urban Renewal Administration has shifted much of its program emphasis to residential conservation and rehabilitation. Even in these programs, however, some degree of family relocation is inevitable. Dwellings must usually be vacated by rehabilitation and there are always some dwellings which are beyond saving by any known structural techniques. Since relocation is thus inescapable, the problem is really one of minimizing the hurt of the families involved, many of

whom have long been neglected by the community agencies.

It appears to the subcommittee that the dissatisfaction of the relocated families arises not only from the racial patterns resulting from relocation but from a variety of accompanying social problems. In many instances relocation acts as a spotlight illuminating the grave problems of the hard-core urban families. The conference on relocation held at Wesleyan University (see Acknowledgments) demonstrated that urban renewal consistently performed this "spotlight" function, arousing indifferent communities to the social, economic, and other problems upon which existing community efforts have so little effect. Increasingly the complex of urban ills is being attacked on an overall basis by foundation-sponsored health, employment, education, and welfare organizations such as Community Progress, Inc., in New Haven.

The need for new forms of help is also sensed, if poorly articulated, by the subject families themselves. Since these families have their only real contact with urban renewal through the LPA relocation service, we sought their reactions to the scope of this service.

When respondents were asked whether the relocation office had been of any help to them in the process of moving into a new neighborhood, only half of the whites answered in the affirmative, compared with 65 percent of the Negroes and 70 percent of the Puerto Rican respondents.[14] However, in response to a second question, we found that 90 percent of the white respondents, 80 percent of the Negro, and 85 percent of the Puerto Rican respondents said that the relocation office had actually paid for their moving.[15] We discovered the striking fact that 81 percent of the white and 58 percent of the Negro respondents who had answered "no" to the first question later told us that the relocation office had paid for their moving expenses.[16] It may be that respondents in both racial groups were thinking of help from the relocation office in terms of other problems than merely helping to pay for moving. Clearly the assistance offered did not "feel" like help, or the assistance offered was not the kind of aid really sought.

A substantially higher proportion of white families (25 percent) than Negro families (9 percent) purchased their own relocated homes. Significantly enough, not one Puerto Rican family in our sample purchased a home.[17] Three-fourths of the white families who purchased homes moved to all-white neighborhoods, and one-fourth to mostly white neighborhoods. On the other hand, among the few Negro families who purchased homes, the majority moved into half-white and half-Negro neighborhoods.[18]

In regard to the value of purchased homes, it is most revealing that about half of the Negro purchasers paid $20,000 or more,

whereas only slightly more than one-third of the white purchasers paid in excess of $20,000. This comparison tends to support a long standing complaint, that the Negro family--when it buys--pays more than a white family for a house in a racially mixed neighborhood. Furthermore, a white family pays, on the average, less than a Negro family for a home in an all-white neighborhood.[19]

The rent paid by the majority of our respondents who did not purchase homes varied directly with their race. On the average, white respondents paid less for rentals than did Negroes, and Puerto Ricans averaged higher rentals than either of the other groups. As a striking example, only 19 percent of white families paid $80 or more per month, compared with 29 percent of the Negro families, and 45 percent of the Puerto Rican families.[20]

The comparative youthfulness[21] and larger average family size[22] of Negroes and Puerto Ricans are not the primary reasons for higher rents paid by them. When we examine the group of families which consisted of adults with children under 16, we find that only 6 percent of the whites paid $80 or more monthly, in comparison with 29 percent of the Negroes, and 42 percent of the Puerto Ricans.[23] Among families having 5 to 7 persons, only 15 percent of the whites paid monthly rentals of $80 or more, in comparison with 38 percent of the Negroes, and 45 percent of the Puerto Ricans.[24]

Admittedly, a comparison of rental values by size of apartment (number of rooms) occupied by each racial group would be valuable, had such data been requested in the interview schedule. However, given the data that we have, with the recognition that larger proportions of Negro families were relocated in racially mixed neighborhoods it seems apparent that Negro and Puerto Rican families, size by size, and type by type, pay monthly rentals in excess of those paid by whites. It is surely an undesirable situation when minority groups have to pay, in effect, a "color tax" either to purchase or to rent a place to live. The situation becomes even less desirable when it is recalled that the relocated minority groups studied here were least able to afford such a "tax," according to relative income levels.

The first and minimal step to combat this situation would be an extensive investigation policy by LPA relocation officials before any of the families to be relocated begin the move.

In summary, the following highlights characterize our interviews of 351 relocated families in five of the larger Connecticut cities during January and February 1963: (It should be borne in mind, once more, that the number of Puerto Rican families interviewed is quite small and, therefore, of limited statistical significance.)

1. The majority of the families, whether white, Negro, or Puerto Rican were self-relocated rather than relocated by the local Redevelopment Authority.

2. White families, considerably more than Negro or Puerto Rican families, were satisfied with their new location and planned to stay.

3. Although most families were relocated in rental accommodations, more whites than Negroes purchased relocation homes.

4. Of those relocated families who rented accommodations, Negroes and Puerto Ricans paid higher rents, even when the size of the families in each group were held constant.

5. Of the relocated families who purchased homes, Negro families paid a higher average purchase price to live in integrated neighborhoods than did whites--higher even than the average paid by whites who moved into all-white or mostly white neighborhoods.

6. The pattern of racial composition of neighborhoods before and after relocation changed much more for white than for Negro relocated families. Whites in fact fled from racially mixed neighborhoods into neighborhoods which were either all-white or mostly white in composition. On the other hand, only a fraction of the Negro families wound up in mostly white neighborhoods, the overwhelming majority being relocated in neighborhoods having 50 percent or more Negroes.

7. White families, if self-relocated, tended to move with greater frequency into all-white neighborhoods than those who were relocated by the LPA. Negro families, if self-relocated, also tended to move more frequently into mostly Negro neighborhoods than did those who were relocated by the LPA.

8. The great majority of all respondents received some help from relocation offices--usually in the form of payment for moving expenses, although their responses suggest that this was not the kind of help they had in mind.

The families interviewed have clearly told us an important story. On the basis of these findings and the studies in chapters II and III, we are prepared to make our major recommendations.

NOTES: CHAPTER IV

1. DID YOU FIND YOUR OWN APARTMENT OR HOUSE, OR DID THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE FIND IT FOR YOU?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self | 83% | 64% | 67% |
| Relocation Office (LPA) | 17 | 36 | 33 |

2. TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH FAMILIES LIVED BEFORE AND AFTER RELOCATION

| | White (179) | | Negro (142) | | P.R. (30) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| All-white | 22% | 51% | -% | -% | 14% | 22% |
| Mostly white | 30 | 31 | 12 | 21 | 28 | 11 |
| Half-white and half-Negro | 29 | 16 | 49 | 41 | 34 | 44 |
| Mostly Negro | 19 | 2 | 28 | 31 | 24 | 19 |
| All-Negro | - | - | 11 | 7 | - | 4 |

3. TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH SELF-RELOCATED FAMILIES LIVED BEFORE AND AFTER RELOCATION

| | White (147) | | Negro (90) | | P.R. (20) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| All-white | 23% | 57% | -% | -% | 11% | 35% |
| Mostly white | 28 | 30 | 8 | 18 | 21 | 6 |
| Half-white and half-Negro | 31 | 11 | 49 | 35 | 37 | 35 |
| Mostly Negro | 18 | 2 | 32 | 40 | 32 | 24 |
| All-Negro | - | - | 11 | 7 | - | - |

4. TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH LPA-RELOCATED FAMILIES LIVED BEFORE AND AFTER RELOCATION

| | White (30) | | Negro (50) | | P.R. (10) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| All-white | 17% | 18% | -% | -% | 20% | -% |
| Mostly white | 38 | 36 | 21 | 27 | 40 | 40 |
| Half-white and half-Negro | 17 | 39 | 50 | 52 | 30 | 50 |
| Mostly Negro | 28 | 7 | 19 | 14 | 10 | 10 |
| All-Negro | - | - | 10 | 7 | - | - |

5. See note 2, supra.

6. See note 3, supra.

7. See note 4, supra.

8. Compare notes 3 and 4, supra.

9. Responses on satisfaction with the new neighborhood:

IN REGARD TO THE RACE OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE, IS THIS NEIGHBORHOOD THE KIND YOU WANTED TO MOVE INTO?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 71% | 52% | 53% |
| No | 9 | 23 | 10 |
| Don't care | 14 | 21 | 33 |
| Don't know | 6 | 4 | 4 |

10. Breakdown of satisfactions expressed with relocation:

IN REGARD TO THE RACE OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE,
IS THIS NEIGHBORHOOD THE KIND YOU WANTED TO MOVE INTO?

| | Self-Relocated Families | | | Families relocated by LPA | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White (147) | Negro (90) | P.R. (20) | White (30) | Negro (50) | P.R. (10) |
| Yes | 73% | 51% | 65% | 63% | 54% | 30% |
| No | 7 | 19 | 5 | 17 | 30 | 20 |
| Don't care | 14 | 23 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 40 |
| Don't know | 6 | 7 | - | 10 | - | 11 |

11. Responses regarding satisfaction with the racial composition of neighborhood:

IN REGARD TO THE RACE OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE,
IS THIS NEIGHBORHOOD THE KIND YOU WANTED TO MOVE INTO?

| | Racial composition of neighborhood | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All-white | Mostly white | Half & half | Mostly Negro | All-Negro |
| White respondents: | (87) | (54) | (27) | (4) | |
| Yes | 87% | 67% | 41% | 25% | |
| No | 1 | 9 | 30 | 50 | |
| Don't care | 9 | 17 | 22 | - | |
| Don't know | 3 | 7 | 7 | 25 | |
| Negro respondents: | | (28) | (55) | (42) | (9) |
| Yes | | 50% | 65% | 35% | 55% |
| No | | 11 | 20 | 29 | 33 |
| Don't care | | 36 | 11 | 29 | 11 |
| Don't know | | 4 | 4 | 7 | - |
| Puerto Rican respondents: | (6) | (3) | (12) | (5) | (1) |
| Yes | 100% | 67% | 25% | 60% | -% |
| No | - | - | 25 | - | - |
| Don't care | - | 33 | 42 | 40 | - |
| Don't know | - | - | 8 | - | 100 |

12. Plans of the relocated families regarding staying in their new communities:

ARE YOU PLANNING TO LIVE HERE AWHILE, OR DO YOU WANT TO MOVE AS SOON AS YOU CAN FIND ANOTHER PLACE?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Stay | 72% | 58% | 50% |
| Move | 22 | 36 | 47 |
| Don't know | 6 | 6 | 3 |

13. This table suggests the relation between the community's racial composition and plans to remain:

PLANS OF RELOCATED FAMILIES TO STAY OR MOVE, BY RACIAL COMPOSITION OF NEIGHBORHOOD

| Are you planning to live here awhile, or do you want to move as soon as you can find another place? | All white | Mostly white | Half & half | Mostly Negro | All-Negro |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White respondents: | (87) | (54) | (27) | (4) | - |
| Stay | 71% | 78% | 63% | 50% | - |
| Move | 22 | 20 | 22 | 50 | - |
| Don't know | 7 | 2 | 15 | - | - |
| Negro respondents: | | (28) | (55) | (42) | (9) |
| Stay | | 54% | 69% | 52% | 44% |
| Move | | 36 | 24 | 45 | 56 |
| Don't know | | 11 | 7 | 3 | - |

14. DID THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE HELP YOU IN ANY WAY?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 50% | 65% | 70% |
| No | 45 | 30 | 23 |
| Don't know | 5 | 5 | 7 |

15. Breakdown of the forms of help:

HOW DID THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE HELP YOU?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Give you a list of apartments | 23% | 21% | 22% |
| Give you the address of this apartment | 15 | 23 | 30 |
| Take you to see any apartments | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| Take you to see this apartment | 15 | 19 | 15 |
| Help you to move | 30 | 40 | 33 |
| Pay for your moving | 90 | 80 | 85 |
| Help you with any special or personal problems | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| Other | 1 | - | 4 |
| Don't know | 2 | 2 | - |

16. Services provided by the relocation officer (respondent's testimony):

DID THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE HELP YOU IN ANY WAY?

| | White Respondents | |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes (91) | No (80) |
| Give you a list of apartments | 30% | 13% |
| Give you the address of this apartment | 20 | 6 |
| Take you to see any apartments | 18 | 4 |
| Take you to see this apartment | 20 | 8 |
| Help you to move | 39 | 18 |
| Pay for your moving | 87 | 81 |
| Help you with any special or personal problems | 9 | 3 |

| | Negro Respondents | |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes (92) | No (43) |
| Give you a list of apartments | 21% | 16% |
| Give you the address of this apartment | 29 | 5 |
| Take you to see any apartments | 11 | 12 |
| Take you to see this apartment | 22 | 9 |
| Help you to move | 47 | 19 |
| Pay for your moving | 80 | 58 |
| Help you with any special or personal problems | 12 | - |

17. Home ownership following relocation:

DO YOU RENT OR OWN YOUR PRESENT HOME?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Own | 25% | 8% | -% |
| Rent | 75 | 92 | 100 |

18. RENTAL OR OWNERSHIP, BY TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD

| | White Respondents | | Negro Respondents | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Own (45) | Rent (127) | Own (10) | Rent (123) |
| All-white | 76% | 42% | -% | -% |
| Mostly white | 24 | 34 | 10 | 22 |
| Half and half | - | 21 | 80 | 38 |
| Mostly Negro | - | 3 | 10 | 33 |
| All-Negro | - | - | - | 7 |

19. Cost of relocatees' purchased homes:

IF OWNED, WHAT IS IT'S VALUE?

| | White (30) | Negro (9) | P.R. (0) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under $10,000 | -% | -% | -% |
| 10,000 - 14,900 | 23 | 33 | - |
| 15,000 - 19,000 | 40 | 12 | - |
| 20,000 - 24,900 | 17 | 22 | - |
| 25,000 or more | 20 | 33 | - |

20. IF RENTED, WHAT IS THE MONTHLY RENT?

| | White (126) | Negro (115) | P.R. (29) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under $40 | 10% | 5% | 7% |
| 40 - 59 | 37 | | 20 |
| 60 - 79 | 34 | 45 | 28 |
| 80 - 99 | 14 | 22 | 17 |
| 100 and over | 5 | 7 | 28 |

21. See chapter I, note 7.

22. See chapter I, note 4.

23. VALUE OF RENTAL, BY COMPOSITION OF FAMILY

| Monthly Rental | Adults only | Adults & children 16 - 20 | Adults & children under 16 | Adults & children of all ages |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| White Respondents | (63) | (15) | (34) | (13) |
| Under $40 | 21% | -% | 35% | 54% |
| 40 - 59 | 36 | 20 | 41 | 23 |
| 60 - 79 | 27 | 67 | 18 | 15 |
| 80 - 99 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 8 |
| 100 and over | 3 | 7 | 3 | - |
| Negro Respondents | (43) | (11) | (58) | (9) |
| Under $40 | 7% | -% | 5% | -% |
| 40 - 59 | 42 | - | 21 | 11 |
| 60 - 79 | 35 | 64 | 45 | 45 |
| 80 - 99 | 12 | 27 | 24 | 33 |
| 100 and over | 5 | 9 | 5 | 11 |
| Puerto Rican Respondents | (4) | (3) | (19) | (3) |
| Under $40 | 25% | -% | 5% | -% |
| 40 - 59 | 25 | - | 21 | 33 |
| 60 - 79 | 25 | 33 | 32 | - |
| 80 - 99 | - | 33 | 16 | 33 |
| 100 and over | 25 | 33 | 26 | 33 |

24. VALUE OF RENTAL, BY SIZE OF FAMILY

| Monthly Rental | Size of Family: One person | 2 - 4 persons | 5 - 7 persons | 8 or more persons |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| White Respondents | (20) | (72) | (27) | (4) |
| Under $40 | 40% | 7% | -% | -% |
| 40 - 59 | 30 | 35 | 48 | 25 |
| 60 - 79 | 20 | 39 | 37 | 25 |
| 80 - 99 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 50 |
| 100 and over | 5 | 4 | - | - |
| Negro Respondents | (13) | (53) | (42) | (11) |
| Under $40 | 15% | 6% | -% | 9% |
| 40 - 59 | 54 | 28 | 21 | - |
| 60 - 79 | 23 | 49 | 40 | 45 |
| 80 - 99 | 8 | 11 | 33 | 36 |
| 100 and over | - | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| Puerto Rican Respondents | (1) | (6) | (16) | (6) |
| Under $40 | 100% | -% | 6% | -% |
| 40 - 59 | - | 16 | 31 | - |
| 60 - 79 | - | 34 | 19 | 50 |
| 80 - 99 | - | 16 | 19 | 16 |
| 100 and over | - | 34 | 25 | 34 |

25. The policy suggested here reflects the attitude expressed in the President's Executive Order No. 11603, "Equal Opportunity in Housing," 27 Fed. Reg. 11527.

# 5. Recommendations

In recommending changes in Federal policy and practice with regard to family relocation, the Connecticut Advisory Committee has sought a level of generality applicable to relocation in communities of all sizes throughout the Nation. Since we have confined our study to relocation in connection with urban renewal programs, our recommendations, for the most part, will be directed and need transmitting to the Urban Renewal Administration.

Our study gives further concrete support to the recommendations made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to the Urban Renewal Administration and the HHFA in 1961, namely, that new programs of rehabilitating and preserving existing housing--rather than clearing every renewal site and dislocating its residents--ought increasingly to be supported; that the Administration should rigorously require communitywide participation, including minority groups, in the planning of projects from their outset; that when altogether new housing has to be constructed, it be open to all; that cities seeking support genuinely demonstrate the availability of adequate rehousing for the families to be relocated; and that, where possible, more than one project be in process simultaneously to keep housing supply open and facilitate the flow of families to be relocated.

New and more specific recommendations seem warranted by our study. We therefore recommend that the Urban Renewal Administration revise its policy and guidelines in the following ways:

1. The Local Public Agency must be committed (a) to encouraging and supporting all families in their efforts to live wherever they desire and are able, (b) to preventing the repetition of previously existing patterns of racially segregated housing, and (c) to making the maximum use of all Federal, State, and local laws, ordinances, and regulations to accomplish the purposes just stated.

Specifically, the LPA, like its sponsor, the Urban Renewal Administration, should recognize that it now has a mandate to implement affirmatively the overriding national policy enunciated by the President in his Executive Order No. 11063* in the provision on prevention of discrimination, because as stated in the preamble "...discriminatory policies and practices result in segregated patterns of housing and necessarily produce other forms of discrimination and segregation which deprive many Americans of equal opportunity...;"

* 27 Fed. Reg. 11527 (1962).

A simple device for the Urban Renewal Administration with respect to this order, would be to amend the following section of its present guidelines--*

> The objectives of relocation are that:
> (1) Families displaced by a Title 1 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.

by rewording paragraph (2) as follows:

> (2) Displacement shall be carried out with a minimum of hardship to site occupants, and without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

2. Home-finding and rehousing must not continue as an unplanned operation. It must be central in the urban renewal process. URA policy should condition approval of grants to projects on the prior availability of standard housing, physically verified, or on firm plans to supply sufficient housing through new construction or rehabilitation. At present the Administration's guidelines encourage project planners to lean too heavily on existing records and materials, and gross, generalized data for determining demands and resources. Often the LPA discovers in midstream that there is not enough alternative housing available. We urge, therefore, the adoption by the Administration of more sensitive and more accurate devices for determining accurately and early in the renewal process the housing needs and housing supply, not the least of which will be more personal contact by LPA with the families themselves.

3. Relocation officers should be directly involved in the LPA's project planning from the outset, and their direct relationship to the families involved should commence at the time of site acquisition, long before relocation itself begins.

4. The families to be affected by the project should be informed in their native language, if necessary, at the outset of launching a project and before relocation actually begins: (a) of the scope of the project and its residential implications for them;

---

* Urban Renewal Administration, HHFA, Urban Renewal Manual: Policies and Requirements for Local Public Agencies, pt. 16, Relocation.

(b) of the aid available to them from the LPA; (c) of the existing State statutes on discrimination in housing and the related procedures (see appendix C for Connecticut's statutes preventing discrimination in housing and urban renewal operations); (d) of the housing possibilities already known to be available from the prior supply study. Furthermore, the preference and needs of the families as to location, kind, and cost of housing should be determined, if possible, at this initial conversation, and should guide the LPA so that it can meet specific housing needs. These initial interviews at the first survey of site occupants may prove very helpful in avoiding the panic reaction we have described.

5. The LPA should include a trained staff member to insure that community support will be given during and after relocation in those situations which stand in the way of successful rehousing--such as poor health, inadequate income, insufficient furniture, ignorance of urban standards of homemaking, and other family or social problems. Because relocation creates a crisis for most families, it offers a uniquely advantageous occasion and opportunity for bringing constructive services into direct use. This trained staff member should be charged with the responsibility for enlisting and coordinating the assistance of the social agencies within the community and encouraging the families to use the services available. He might well be the staff member responsible for maintaining formal contact with displaced families following their relocation for a longer period than at present.

6. The pace of projects should whenever necessary be slowed down to assure longer time for the counseling and assistance of families to be relocated. It is now recognized that relocation is the most critical single factor in urban renewal, and it should therefore be the key factor in determining the timetable.

7. Analysis and assessment by the Urban Renewal Administration of all projects should be required more frequently than every 2 years and in more depth than at present, and LPA directors should be required to make such modifications as are shown to be necessary in order to achieve the maximum benefits from the projects.

8. Since public housing is an important resource for rehousing, its image and actual operation must be significantly improved. Without such changes, public housing will continue to make only a negligible contribution to relocation. The scheduling of additional public housing construction by the Public Housing Authority and the selection of sites for it should be closely coordinated with all other renewal activities of a given city. To make public housing a desirable goal for families requiring relocation, there must be considerable improvement in the

administration of public housing projects.

9. Federal grants should be awarded to only those cities which demonstrate commitment to codifying, strengthening, and enforcing standard housing and health and building codes.

The general purpose of our recommendations is to make relocation an integral part of the renewal process; to assure an optimum relationship between the processes of displacement and housing production; to permit the rate of housing production or volume of available housing to modify the pace of relocation and of the entire project; to shift the emphasis in urban renewal from site clearance and place it on improving the housing and neighborhoods for the people to be rehoused; to make relocation an occasion for providing equal housing opportunities for all citizens, regardless of race, and for preventing the recurrence of previous patterns of segregated housing; and to convert it into a process which, by minimizing hurt and maximizing help, assists people in human rebuilding.

If these recommendations are adopted and implemented, family relocation need no longer be an obstacle to urban renewal; it will become its key constructive and positive element. By achieving the rehabilitation of people along with the rehabilitation of structure, and by encouraging diversity throughout the community, relocation will no longer be a painful process, the price paid for progress, it will be a fundamental part of progress itself.

# Acknowledgments

Subcommittee I of the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights is especially indebted to:

The Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights. Thomas F. Henry, the Commission's executive secretary, met with our subcommittee several times at the outset of the study. Through his good offices, the chairman of the commission, Elmo Roper, and deputy chairman, Ralph Goglia, and the full commission authorized its research director, Dr. Henry G. Stetler, to assist us in analyzing relocation practices in some selected Connecticut cities.

Dr. Henry G. Stetler. Dr. Stetler's contribution in training the interviewers required for our study, tabulating and interpreting their results, and superintending the entire process has been altogether indispensable.

Robert Feldman. Mr. Feldman, a senior in the Yale Law School, was instrumental in drafting the interview schedule for relocation officials in Connecticut. In addition to supervising its administration to 14 officials, he has served throughout the study in a variety of invaluable capacities.

Frank Logue. Mr. Logue, consultant to the U.S. Commission for New England, assisted our subcommittee in ways beyond his formal responsibilities. A resident of Trumbull, Conn., he took a special interest in this project and contributed his time and himself in an exceptional way.

Mrs. Arthur Dillingham and Mrs. Martin Weitzler. Mrs. Dillingham, of Meriden, Professor Maguire's secretary, and Mrs. Weitzler, of Oxford, Professor Pollak's secretary, provided exceedingly helpful clerical assistance to the group. Indeed, without their unusual contributions this report and the work of our subcommittee could not have been done.

Wesleyan University. The university's Institute of Ethics and Politics, which periodically holds weekend conferences of faculty, and political, professional, and business leaders, convened a meeting of urban renewal directors and relocation officers on February 15-16, 1963, to discuss various aspects of their responsibility for public policy and its execution. In addition, the university several times provided a meeting place for our subcommittee and gave various kinds of assistance throughout the study to our Chairman, Professor John David Maguire.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A--The Research Problem and Procedure

The tabulated material throughout this report, and especially the core of chapter IV, involved the gathering and analysis of data secured through field interviews with recently relocated families. It is the outgrowth of a request for research assistance made in August 1962 to the Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights by the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. The Connecticut Advisory Committee was concerned with "the impact of the Urban Renewal Program on racial discrimination in housing."

With the limited time available, a project was designed to determine the policies and practices of Urban Renewal Administration authorities in Connecticut in regard to the relocation of minority group families, i.e., whether they assumed any responsibility for preventing the recurrence of racially segregated neighborhoods among relocated families. It was felt that interviews with a representative cross section of relocated families would provide some clues as to whether the recurrence of segregated neighborhoods represented the preference of relocated families or was imposed upon them by circumstances beyond their control.

Twenty-nine cities in Connecticut had urban redevelopment projects at the time this study was initiated in the fall of 1962. Of these, 14 cities were initially selected for the purpose of interviewing the project officials who were in charge of the relocation of families. The questions asked in the course of these interviews are reproduced in appendix B (schedule I) and the results are discussed in chapter III. These 14 cities include approximately three-fourths of the total nonwhite population of Connecticut, and were chosen because one of the basic purposes of our inquiry was to make a comparison between the relocation of white and nonwhite families.

In order to supplement the information secured from the relocation officers, the decision was made to interview a representative cross section of families involved in the relocation process. For this purpose we selected 5 of the 14 cities--Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, Norwalk, and New Britain. Since the nonwhite population of Connecticut is concentrated in the larger metropolitan areas, these five cities included approximately four-fifths of all nonwhite families to be displaced, and approximately nine-tenths of all nonwhite families that had already been relocated at the time we started our inquiry. (See Introduction, note 5.)

The sample of families to be interviewed in the five cities was selected by us in cooperation with the relocation officers in each of the cities. The names and addresses of the sample of relocated families were taken from the most recently completed project in each of the cities. The total sample included slightly more than 700 families, which represented about a third of the 2,000 families that had been relocated in this group of projects. (See Introduction, note 8, and chapter I, note 2.)

The sample of Negro families selected in each city was roughly proportionate to the percentage of Negro families in the population. It is felt that the total Negro sample is representative of Negro families relocated in these cities, as well as of Negro families relocated in the State inasmuch as at least two-thirds of the State's Negro population is concentrated in the five cities. The sample of relocated white families was chosen to match the number of relocated Negro families in each city and may be considered to be representative of relocated white families in the larger metropolitan areas.

Having selected a total sample of 720 families, we proceeded to make contact with them at the relocated addresses provided by the relocation offices. For this purpose, we utilized a corps of volunteer interviewers recruited in each of the cities through the cooperation of colleges, universities, churches, private intergroup agencies, and other civic groups. These volunteers received professional instruction and direction from members of the Research Division of the State Civil Rights Commission in order to insure uniformity in completing the interviews.

The schedule to be administered included a variety of questions on matters such as types of assistance received from the relocation offices, self-relocation (if any), satisfaction with the new location and plans to move or stay, ownership or rental values, racial composition of the neighborhood before and after relocation, satisfaction with the racial composition of the new neighborhood, and race, sex, age, occupation, and type and size of family of each respondent. (See schedule III, appendix B.)

Of the sample of families selected, we succeeded in completing interviews with a total of 351 or 49 percent of the total. (See Introduction, note 8.) These included 179 white, 142 Negro, and 30 Puerto Rican families. The Puerto Rican category emerged during the process of field interviewing, and was not identified as such in the original sample. Although data on Puerto Rican families are analyzed separately in this report, the small number of cases does not give it the validity comparable to the white or Negro categories.

It is worth noting that of the 720 families in our sample we were not successful in completing interviews with 26 percent because they had moved from the address furnished us by the relocation office. Another 18 percent were not at home even after repeated visits by our field interviewers. Only 1 percent refused outright to be interviewed after they became aware of the nature of the interrogation. We must recognize that the universe of families involved in relocation includes a substantial proportion of families characterized by low income and relative instability, and hence more likely to move even after they had been relocated at a new address.

One indication of the representativeness of our white and nonwhite sample of relocated families is found in the consistency between the replies of our respondents and LPA records in regard to the "self-relocation" of families. In our sample 83 percent of the whites, 64 percent of the Negroes, and 67 percent of the Puerto Ricans said that they had relocated themselves. The records in the LPA offices in the cities from which the sample was drawn indicated that 73 percent of the whites and 68 percent of the nonwhites had relocated themselves. The slightly higher proportion of "self-relocation" in our study resulted in part from our grouping of home purchasers and renters, whereas the LPA records refer only to the self-relocation of rental families. In fact, our study reveals that 90 percent of home purchasers, whether white or Negro, were self-relocated.

## APPENDIX B--Schedules Used in Interviewing

### Schedule I: An Interview With Relocation Officers

The Connecticut Civil Rights Commission, in cooperation with the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the United States Civil Rights Commission, is currently making a survey of relocation practices in selected Connecticut cities. Your cooperation in answering the following questions would be deeply appreciated.

1. How did residential relocation come to be a necessity in this community?

   a. What were living conditions like in the renewal sites before redevelopment got under way?

   b. In general, what was the composition of the site families in regard to the following characteristics?

      (1) Economic:

      (2) Employment:

      (3) Transients:

      (4) Juvenile delinquency and crime:

      (5) Living habits and family structure:

2. What is the principal housing resource for families to be relocated in rental housing?

   a. If it is public housing, is there a discernible resistance to it by the families to be relocated?

      (1) If so, what do you think are the reasons?

3. Once relocation was found to be necessary, what attempts were made to distribute the families to be relocated in the existing house supply?

a. How did your office determine the housing resources then available?

4. Has your office experimented with any families by supplementing their own funds with public funds that would permit them to occupy private rentals at public housing rates?

a. If so, what have been the results?

5. What has been your experience with relocation families using the new section 221 of the FHA mortgage insurance programs?

a. How many have used them?

b. Have some wanted to use them but been unable? Why?

c. Are the provisions of the present acts liberal enough to qualify all families who can responsibly benefit from it?

6. How did your office go about the task of informing families to be relocated of the choices of housing which might be available to them?

a. Can you recommend ways of doing this for other communities based on your own experience?

7. Has the Citizen's Advisory Group, formed under the Urban Renewal Act for the purpose of assisting you, really functioned effectively?

a. What do they do?

b. What would you like them to do?

8. What has been the role of private property owners and real estate agents in the relocation process?

9. In retrospect, which programs or experiments have proved to be most helpful and useful to you in assisting families to relocate? Explain.

10. What in your judgement, are the major factors determining the kinds of neighborhoods in which relocated families are housed?

a. Do families on welfare pose special relocation problems?

11. Has clustering by racial or ethnic groups occurred? Explain.

12. What do you feel that your community expects of the relocation program?

13. Would you say that your work in relocation involves:

a. Reproducing existing racial and ethnic patterns in new neighborhoods.

b. Ignoring racial and ethnic considerations.

c. Using relocation to break down racial or ethnic divisions.

d. None of these.

e. If "d," what would you say your work in relocation involves?

FACTUAL

1. Could you furnish us with the names of persons serving on the Citizen's Advisory Committee?

   a. Are any of these persons Negro or Puerto Rican?

2. Could you tell us the number of white and nonwhite families to be relocated?

   a. What proportion of each are welfare cases?

3. Could we have access to the names and addresses of the families that

   a. Have already been relocated.

   b. Are to be relocated.

4. Could you locate for us, on a map, the placement of Negroes in

   a. Public Housing.

   b. Private Housing.

      (1) Rentals.

      (2) Purchases.

5. How did you become interested in relocation?

Schedule II: Families To Be Relocated

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION IS MAKING A BRIEF SURVEY OF FAMILIES IN THIS AREA WHO ARE TO BE RELOCATED. WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR COOPERATION IN ANSWERING A FEW QUESTIONS.

1. Do you plan to find your own apartment or house or would you prefer to have the man from the relocation office find it for you?

| | |
|---|---|
| self | ____1 |
| relocation man | ____2 |
| don't know | ____3 |

2. When you move, do you want to live in

| | |
|---|---|
| a one family house | ____1 |
| a 2 or 3 family house | ____2 |
| a public housing project | ____3 |
| it makes no difference | ____4 |
| don't know | ____5 |

3. When you move, would you prefer to be

| | |
|---|---|
| close to downtown | ____1 |
| some distance removed from downtown | ____2 |
| it makes no difference | ____3 |
| don't know | ____4 |

4. Do you rent or own your present home

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (ask #5) | own | ____1 |
| (skip to #6) | rent | ____2 |
| | don't know | ____3 |

5. If owned, what is it's value?_____ don't know _____
don't care
to answer _____

6. If rented, what is the

| | |
|---|---|
| weekly rent | ____1 |
| monthly rent | ____2 |
| don't care to answer | ____3 |
| don't know | ____4 |

7. How were you notified by the man from the relocation office that you would have to move

| | |
|---|---|
| by letter | ____1 |
| through a telephone call | ____2 |
| a visit from the relocation man | ____3 |
| some other way | ____4 |
| don't know | ____5 |

(Explain response "some other way" on reverse side of questionnaire.)

8. When you move, would you rather live in a neighborhood with

| | |
|---|---|
| only white people | ____1 |
| mostly white people | ____2 |
| about half white and half Negro people | ____3 |
| mostly Negro people | ____4 |
| don't know | ____5 |

9. Does this neighborhood have:

| | |
|---|---|
| only white people | ____1 |
| mostly white people | ____2 |
| about half white and half Negro people | ____3 |
| mostly Negro people | ____4 |
| only Negro people | ____5 |
| don't know | ____6 |

10. If you could move anywhere you wanted in this city, how would your new place be different from where you live now?

11. Did the man from the relocation office

| | |
|---|---|
| give you a list of apartments | ____1 |
| give you the address of this apartment | ____2 |
| take you to see any apartments | ____3 |
| take you to see this apartment | ____4 |
| help you to move | ____5 |
| pay for your moving | ____6 |
| help you with any special problems | ____7 |
| other | ____8 |
| don't know | ____9 |

(If "other" explain, in detail on reverse side of questionnaire.)

12. Did you want the man from the relocation office to give you information about several neighborhoods?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | ____1 |
| No | ____2 |
| Don't know | ____3 |

INTERVIEWER: MARK EACH ITEM WHICH IS ANSWERED "YES"

13. Did you want to know about

| | |
|---|---|
| the school situation | ____1 |
| the location of churches | ____2 |
| where the colored and white people live | ____3 |
| the location of stores and shopping centers | ____4 |
| transportation | ____5 |
| anything else | ____6 |
| don't know | ____7 |

(Explain the response "anything else" on the reverse side of questionnaire.)

14. SIZE OF FAMILY (those living in the same apartment or house):

_____number of adults (those 21 or over)
_____number of children, age 16 to 20
_____number of children, age 15 or younger
_____total number of family

15. (BY OBSERVATION)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Race: | White | _____1 |
| | Negro | _____2 |
| | Puerto Rican | _____3 |

16. (BY OBSERVATION)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sex: | Male | _____1 |
| | Female | _____2 |

17. (ESTIMATE)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Age: | Under 35 | _____1 |
| | 35 to 50 yrs. | _____2 |
| | over 50 | _____3 |

Schedule III: Families Recently Relocated

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION IS MAKING A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE FAMILIES IN THIS AREA WHO HAVE BEEN RELOCATED. WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR COOPERATION IN ANSWERING A FEW QUESTIONS.

1. Did you find your own apartment or house, or did the man from the relocation office find it for you?

| | |
|---|---|
| self | ____1 |
| relocation man | ____2 |
| don't know | ____3 |

2. Are you planning to live here awhile, or do you want to move as soon as you can find another place?

| | |
|---|---|
| stay | ____1 |
| move | ____2 |
| don't know | ____3 |

3. Do you like this apartment?

| | |
|---|---|
| yes | ____1 |
| no | ____2 |
| don't know | ____3 |

4. Do you rent or own your present home?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (ask No. 5) | own | ____1 |
| (skip to No. 6) | rent | ____2 |
| | don't know | ____3 |

5. If owned, what is it's value? _____

| | |
|---|---|
| don't know | ____1 |
| don't care to answer | ____2 |

6. If rented, what is the

| | |
|---|---|
| weekly rent | ____1 |
| monthly rent | ____2 |
| don't care to answer | ____3 |
| don't know | ____4 |

7. How were you notified by the man from the relocation office that you would have to move?

| | |
|---|---|
| by letter | ____1 |
| a telephone call | ____2 |
| a visit from the relocation man | ____3 |
| some other way | ____4 |
| don't know | ____5 |

8. BEFORE, you moved, did the neighborhood where you used to live have

| | |
|---|---|
| only white people | ____1 |
| mostly white people | ____2 |
| about half white and half Negro people | ____3 |
| mostly Negro people | ____4 |
| only Negro people | ____5 |
| don't know | ____6 |

9. Does this neighborhood have

| | |
|---|---|
| only white people | ____1 |
| mostly white people | ____2 |
| about half white and half Negro people | ____3 |
| mostly Negro people | ____4 |
| only Negro people | ____5 |
| don't know | ____6 |

10. In regard to the race of the people who live here, is this neighborhood the kind you want to move into?

| | |
|---|---|
| yes | ____1 |
| no | ____2 |
| don't care | ____3 |
| don't know | ____4 |

11. Did the man from the relocation office help you in any way?

| | |
|---|---|
| yes | ____1 |
| no | ____2 |
| don't know | ____3 |

12. Did the man from the relocation office

| | |
|---|---|
| give you a list of apartments | ____1 |
| give you the address of this apartment | ____2 |
| take you to see any apartments | ____3 |
| take you to see this apartment | ____4 |
| help you to move | ____5 |
| pay for your moving | ____6 |
| help you with any special or personal problems | ____7 |
| other | ____8 |
| don't know | ____9 |

(If other, explain, in detail, on reverse side of questionnaire.)

13. Did you want the man from the relocation office to give you information about several neighborhoods?

| | |
|---|---|
| yes | ____1 |
| no | ____2 |
| don't know | ____3 |

14. (TO INTERVIEWER: Ask the following questions regardless of the reply to answer No. 13. Since there may be more than one reply, be sure to check each item to which there is an affirmative answer.)

Did you want to know about

| | |
|---|---|
| the school situation | ____1 |
| the location of churches | ____2 |
| where the colored and white people live | ____3 |
| the location of stores and shopping centers | ____4 |
| transportation | ____5 |
| anything else | ____6 |
| don't know | ____7 |

(Explain the response "anything else" on the reverse side of the questionnaire.)

15. Race of respondent: (by observation)

| | |
|---|---|
| white | ____1 |
| Negro | ____2 |
| Puerto Rican | ____3 |

16. Sex of respondent: (by observation)

| | |
|---|---|
| male | ____1 |
| female | ____2 |

17. Age of respondent: (estimate)

| | |
|---|---|
| under 35 | ____1 |
| 35 to 50 years | ____2 |
| over 50 | ____3 |

18. OCCUPATION OF PRINCIPAL WAGE EARNER IN FAMILY
(for example: electrician, typist, machine operator, laborer)

_____

19. SIZE OF FAMILY (those living in the same apartment or house)

_____number of adults
_____number of children 16 to 20
_____number of children 15 or younger
_____total number

NAME OF RESPONDENT _____

STATE ADDRESS _____ CITY _____

APPENDIX C--GENERAL STATUTES OF CONNECTICUT, Secs. 53-34 to 53-36*

(Statutes prohibiting discrimination in housing and urban renewal operations.)

53-34. Deprivation of rights on account of alienage, color or race.--Any person who subjects, or causes to be subjected, any other person to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities, secured or protected by the constitution or laws of this State or of the United States, on account of alienage, color, or race, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

53-35. Discrimination in public accommodations and rental housing on account of race, creed, or color.--All persons within the jurisdiction of this state shall be entitled to full and equal accommodations in every place of public accommodation, resort or amusement, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable alike to all persons; and any denial of such accommodation by reason of race, creed or color of the applicant therefor shall be a violation of the provisions of this section. Any discrimination, segregation or separation, on account of race, creed or color, shall be a violation of this section. A place of public accommodation, resort or amusement within the meaning of this section means any establishment, which caters or offers its services or facilities or goods to the general public including, but not limited to, public housing projects and all other forms of publicly assisted housing, and further including any housing accommodation or building lot, on which it is intended that a housing accommodation will be constructed, offered for sale or rent which is one of three or more housing accommodations or building lots all of which are located on a single parcel of land or parcels of land that are contiguous without regard to highways or streets, and all of which any person owns or otherwise controls the sale or rental thereof or has owned or otherwise controlled the sale or rental thereof within one year prior to an act in violation of this section. In determining ownership or control of a particular number of housing accommodations or lots for purposes of this section, all housing accommodations or lots which are owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the same interests shall be deemed to be owned or controlled by one person. Any person who violates any provision of this section shall be fined not less than twenty-five nor more than one hundred dollars or imprisoned not more than thirty days or both.

* Gen. Stats. of Conn. (1958 Revision), 53-34 to 53-36, as amended by House Bill No. 3590, Public Act 472, Laws 1961, Connecticut Regular Session (1961), approved June 5, 1961. (Conformed to Commerce Clearing House copy of House Bill No. 3590.)

53-36. Complaint to civil rights commission. Commission may issue complaint. In addition to the penalties provided for violation of sections 53-34 and 53-35, any person claiming to be aggrieved by a violation of either section may, by himself or his attorney, make, sign, and file with the civil rights commission a complaint in writing under oath which shall state the circumstances of such violation and the particulars thereof and shall contain such other information as may be required by the commission. In addition, the commission whenever it has reason to believe that section 53-35 has been or is being violated, may issue a complaint. The commission may thereupon proceed upon such complaint in the same manner and with the same powers as provided in Chapter 563 in the case of unfair employment practices, and the provisions of said chapter as to the powers, duties and rights of the commission, the complainant, the court, the attorney general, and the respondent shall apply to any proceeding under the provisions of this section.

APPENDIX D--Tabulated Information Concerning Relocated Families Not Presented in the Text of the Report

DID YOU FIND YOUR OWN APARTMENT OR HOUSE, OR DID THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE FIND IT FOR YOU? --BY OWNERSHIP AND RENTALS

Home Owners

| | White (44) | Negro (11) |
|---|---|---|
| Self-relocated | 91% | 91% |
| LPA relocated | 9 | 9 |

Home Renters

| | White (133) | Negro (129) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self-relocated | 80% | 62% | 67% |
| LPA relocated | 20 | 38 | 33 |

---

DO YOU LIKE THIS APARTMENT?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 81% | 73% | 70% |
| No | 16 | 23 | 27 |
| Don't know | 3 | 4 | 3 |

---

SEX OF RESPONDENT

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 35% | 37% | 50% |
| Female | 65 | 63 | 50 |

DID YOU WANT THE MAN FROM THE RELOCATION OFFICE TO GIVE YOU INFORMATION ABOUT SEVERAL NEIGHBORHOODS?

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 20% | 32% | 33% |
| No | 69 | 59 | 40 |
| Don't know | 11 | 9 | 27 |

---

RESPONDENTS BY CITY RELOCATED

| | White (179) | Negro (142) | P.R. (30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hartford | 21% | 40% | 63% |
| New Haven | 36 | 23 | 10 |
| Bridgeport | 23 | 21 | 17 |
| Norwalk | 11 | 7 | 3 |
| New Britian | 9 | 9 | 7 |